





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2016

AN  
INQUIRY  
INTO THE CONSEQUENCES  
OF  
NEGLECTING TO GIVE THE PRAYER BOOK  
WITH THE BIBLE.  
INTERSPERSED WITH  
REMARKS.  
ON SOME LATE SPEECHES AT CAMBRIDGE,  
AND OTHER IMPORTANT MATTER  
RELATIVE TO  
*The British and Foreign Bible Society.*

---

✓  
BY HERBERT MARSH, D.D. F.R.S.  
MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY.

---

SECOND EDITION.

~~~~~

LONDON:

*Printed by Law and Gilbert, St. John's-Square, Clerkenwell;*

AND SOLD BY RIVINGTONS, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD; AND  
DEIGHTON, NICHOLSON, AND BARRETT, CAMBRIDGE.

---

1812.



## AN INQUIRY, &c.

---

WHOEVER objects to the British and Foreign Bible Society is invariably asked; Where is the *harm* of giving away a *Bible*? I will answer therefore by saying, *None whatever*. On the contrary, the more widely the Scriptures are disseminated, the greater in all respects must be the good produced.

Having answered *this* question, and, as I hope, to the satisfaction of every member in the Society, I beg leave to ask in my turn; Where is the *harm* of giving away a *Prayer Book*? Of course I propose this question only to *those* members of the Society, who are also members of the *Church*. For I have explicitly declared, both in the Sermon at St. Paul's; and in the Address to the Senate, that I have no desire to interfere, either with the religious opinions, or the religious conduct of the *Dissenters*. An attempt to impose the Liturgy on men, who from principle *reject it*, would be a violation of that religious liberty, which I sincerely hope will ever be maintained in this country. I neither expect therefore, nor even *desire*, unless it is their own *voluntary* act, that Dissenters should either give or receive our Book of Common Prayer. I am addressing myself to Churchmen in their intercourse with



Churchmen, such as the Clergyman of a parish has with his parishioners. And, as the Liturgy is the Book which *distinguishes* Churchmen, I 'may certainly ask of *them*, Where can be the harm, when we give away a Bible, of giving *also* a Prayer Book? As I think no real Churchman would say that there *is*, he cannot consistently object to those, who *recommmend* their joint distribution. Secondly, I ask the Churchman, whether it is not *useful*, when we give away a Bible, to give also the Book of Common Prayer, not as a *Corrective*, a name lately given it by the Dean of Carlisle<sup>1</sup>, but as a proper *Companion* for the Bible. Does it not contain devotional exercises composed in the *true spirit* of the Scriptures? Is it not the Book, which we hear constantly at Church; and is it not equally designed for our meditations in the closet? The *usefulness* then of this book to every Churchman, I think, no Churchman can *deny*. He cannot therefore, at least not with consistency, complain of those, who object to the *withholding* of this usefulness; who object to the *omission* of giving the Liturgy; or, in other words, who object to the distribution, on the part of Churchmen, of the Bible *alone* or without the *Liturgy*. Thirdly, I ask the Churchman, whether it is not *necessary*, when he gives Bibles to the poor, (I do not mean among Dissenters, as I have repeatedly declared) to provide them at the same time with a *Prayer Book*? Ought it not to be used by *every* Churchman? and can he join in the service

---

<sup>1</sup> In his speech at the Town Hall, on Thursday the 12th of December.

of the Church *without* it? Can it therefore be a matter of *indifference*, whether the poor of our establishment are provided with *Prayer Books*? Do we perform our *duty*, do we properly provide for their *religious instruction*, if we provide them only with the Bible, and leave them *unprovided* with the Prayer Book? In this case, the Rubrick and the Canons have very unnecessarily enforced the learning of the *Church Catechism*. When we further consider, that there is at present hardly a town, or even a village, which is not visited by illiterate teachers, who expound the Bible with more confidence than the most profound theologian, it becomes *doubly* necessary, if we would preserve the poor of the establishment in the religion of their fathers, to provide them with a safeguard against the delusions of *false interpretation*. And what better safeguard *can* we offer than the Book of Common Prayer, which contains the doctrines of the Bible, according to its *true* exposition; in which those doctrines are applied, throughout the prayers and collects, to the best purposes of religion, and are condensed in a manner, which is intelligible to all, in that excellent formula the Church Catechism? Under these circumstances, to leave the poor, who without assistance cannot *understand* the Scriptures, as the itinerant preachers themselves admit by their own practice, to leave, I say, the poor, under such circumstances, to be tossed about by every wind of doctrine, which they *must* be unless provided with that authorised exposition of the Scriptures, which is contained in the Liturgy, and which every honest Churchman must believe to be the *true* one, is at least in *my*

judgement (I speak with deference to the judgement of others) such a dereliction of our duty as Churchmen, that I little expected, to hear Clergymen, within the precincts of the University, reprehend a Professor of Divinity, because he contended, that the Prayer Book should be distributed with the Bible.

But though I certainly did not *expect* it, I am still ready to confess, that if it is *really blameable*, to object to the distribution, on the part of Churchmen, of the Bible *alone*, or unaccompanied with the *Liturgy*, the modern Bible Society can require no further vindication. For if the proposition, which I have hitherto ventured to maintain, is not only untenable, but a fit subject for *reproach*, it necessarily follows, that the omission of the Prayer Book, in the distribution of the Bible, is not only *allowable*, but *laudable*. Now, that I *have* been reproached, and *bitterly* reproached for asserting that Churchmen should not content themselves with distributing only *Bibles* to the poor, is a matter of notoriety. To say nothing of other places, where I have been attacked on this account, I need only appeal to what was said at the public Meeting in Cambridge for the formation of an Auxiliary Society, especially in the speeches of Dr. Milner and Dr. Clarke<sup>2</sup>. Strange, therefore, as it may appear, that a Professor of Divinity should have now to defend him-

---

<sup>2</sup> The Speeches to which I allude were delivered in the Town Hall of Cambridge, on December 12, 1811, and were printed in the Cambridge Chronicle of December 20, of course with the knowledge and approbation of the speakers.



self, in his own University, against the charge of pleading for the Liturgy, yet as I am put on my defence, I must request to be heard, before I am finally condemned.

The first person who particularly complained of the objection to the distribution of the Bible alone, that is, as repeatedly explained, without the Prayer Book, was Dr. Clarke. “Is the distribution of the Bible *alone* (says Dr. Clarke) detrimental to the interests of the establishment? Have we forgot that we are Englishmen? Have we forgot that we are PROTESTANTS? What would Latimer, and Ridley, and Chillingworth have thought or said had they lived unto this day to bear testimony to such a declaration? As the only answer to it, I, as a member, and as a minister of the Church of England, do not hesitate to declare, so soon as it shall be proved, that the distribution of the Bible alone is hostile to the interests of the established church, then, and then only, be that church subverted.” Such are grounds, on which a Churchman justifies the distribution of the Bible *alone*, or unaccompanied with the *Liturgy*: and they deserve particular examination, not as being the sentiments of an *individual*, but as being the sentiments of a *party*. This is evident, not only from the general applause with which the speech was received, but from the circumstance, that the same sentiments are now entertained by very respectable writers, and are even conveyed through the channel of the public papers.

Before I examine the grounds, on which my objection to the omission of the Liturgy is now ar-

raigned, I beg leave to call the attention of the reader to the FACT, that the omission of the Liturgy, in the distribution of the Bible, *is* justified, and justified by *Churchmen*. And I request the reader to keep this FACT in remembrance, because we shall find it of great importance, when the views of the Society are more particularly examined.

## II.

I acknowledge, that the arguments for the distribution of the *Bible alone* are so specious, so popular, so apparently in the spirit of true *Protestantism*, while the arguments for the contrary lie so concealed from the public view, and are now so confidently asserted to savour of Popery<sup>3</sup>, that they are equally difficult to explain, and dangerous to propose. Believing, however, as I do, that there is a fallacy in the arguments of those who oppose me, and conscious of the rectitude of my intentions, I tremble not at the obstacles, which present themselves on every side. If it were now a question, as it was at the Reformation, whether the *Bible* should be distributed or not, men might justly exclaim to those who *withheld* it; can the Bible be injurious

---

<sup>3</sup> "They are such, as were used by *Papists* at the Reformation, and can only be advanced by those, who think the Church of England cannot stand the test of the word of God." This passage is taken from a Letter in the Shrewsbury Chronicle signed, "A member of the Established Church."—N. B. I have been informed that there is another Letter in the Shrewsbury Chronicle to the same purport: but I have not yet seen it.

to the real interest of the Church ! But this is NOT the question, as every one must know, who argues against me. There were channels in abundance for the distribution of the *Bible*, long before the existence of the modern Society. And I challenge my opponents to declare, whether *they* have laboured harder, than I have done, to promote the *study* of it<sup>4</sup>. But it is urged, if you still require, that the Bible, however extensively you may be willing to distribute it, should be accompanied by the *Liturgy*, you must certainly suspect, that there is danger to the established Church from the distribution of the Bible *alone*<sup>5</sup>. Here let me ask, whether

---

<sup>4</sup> That the reader however may judge of the *Christian Spirit* which animates some of the advocates of this Society, at the very time when they are boasting of their *promotion* of Christianity, I need only quote the following passage from a Letter, which first appeared in the Suffolk papers, was reprinted in Cambridge with a superscription *alluding to my Address to the Senate*, and was very generally distributed in Cambridge within a few days after that Address. The author of this Letter speaking of the auxiliary Societies now forming in different parts of the kingdom says “ And yet to these Societies there are they, who *dare* to object. “ I say *dare*, because, circulated as the New Testament has “ been described to be, without tract or comment, they who “ oppose *them*, oppose the circulation of the *word of God*, as “ originally delivered forth, and would have probably opposed “ *our Saviour himself*, had they lived in his time.”—On such language and conduct it is unnecessary to make an observation.

<sup>5</sup> It can be hardly necessary to repeat what I have already explained, that, when I contend for the distribution of the *Liturgy* in company with the Bible, I mean only among *members of the Church of England*. It would indeed be *useless*, to give away a book to those whose religious principles must induce them to *reject* it, whether those persons lived in England or abroad.

the *Bible itself* is not capable of *perversion*, whether the *best of Books* may not be misapplied to the *worst of purposes*? Have we not inspired authority for answering this question in the affirmative? St. Peter himself, speaking of the Epistles of St. Paul, said, “ In which are some things hard to be understood, “ which they that are *unlearned and unstable* wrest “ as they do also the *other scriptures*, unto their own “ destruction.” Would St. Peter, if he had lived in the present age, have thought this admonition *less* necessary, than in the age of the Apostles? Can Churchmen therefore who know, that *one party* wrests the scriptures, by the aid of false interpretation, into authority for the rejection of the *Trinity and the Atonement*, that *another party* wrests them into authority for the rejection of the *Sacraments*, that *other parties* again on the authority of the same Bible, prove other doctrines, which are at variance with their own, think it *unnecessary*, when they distribute Bibles to the poor, who are incapable, without assistance, of judging for themselves, and who alone are the objects of *gratuitous* distribution, can Churchmen, I say, under such circumstances think it *unnecessary* to accompany the Bible with the Liturgy, in which the doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, the Sacraments, with the other doctrines of our Church, are delivered as *contained* in the Bible? It is not the *Bible itself*, but the *perversion* of it, the *wresting* of the Scriptures (as St. Peter expresses it) by the “ unlearned and unstable,” with which England now swarms, whence the danger proceeds. And this danger must increase in proportion as we *neglect* the means of *counteracting* it. But



if we neglect to provide the poor of the establishment with the Book of Common Prayer, as well as with the Bible, we certainly neglect the means of preventing their seduction from the Established Church. The Dissenters *remain* Dissenters, because they use not the Liturgy; and Churchmen will *become* Dissenters, if they likewise neglect to use it with the Bible. Have the persons to whom Bibles are *gratuitously* distributed, either the leisure, or the inclination, or the ability, to weigh the arguments for *religious* opinions? Do they possess the knowledge and the judgement, which are necessary to direct men in the *choice* of their religion? Must they not *learn* it therefore from their instructors? And can there be a *better* instructor, in the opinion of Churchmen, than the Book of Common Prayer?

But the Bible *alone* contains all things, which are necessary for *Salvation*: and to assert the contrary is to argue in the spirit, not of a Protestant, but of a Papist!—This position is indisputably true; it is the very *basis* of Protestantism; and no Protestant, as far as I know, has ever contended, that any doctrine should be received as an article of Faith, which is not contained in the *Bible*. But have not Christians of *every age and nation* been at variance on the question, what doctrines *are* contained in the Bible? If you ask a Trinitarian why he *receives* the doctrine of the Trinity, he will answer, Because it is contained in the Bible. If you ask a Unitarian, why he *rejects* that doctrine, he will answer that it is *not* contained in the Bible. On the authority of the Bible the Church of England admits only *two* Sacraments, in opposition to the Church of Rome, while



the Quakers, in opposition to the Church of England, admit no Sacrament at all. From the same Bible the Calvinist proves the doctrine of *absolute* decrees, and the Arminian the doctrine of *conditional* salvation. On the Bible the Church of England grounds the doctrine of the Atonement, which, with reference to the same authority, is discarded by the modern Socinians. If you ask a Churchman why it is right to *kneel* at the altar, when he receives the sacrament, he will answer, that it is an act of reverence, due from every Christian to the institutor of that holy rite, at whose name, it is declared in scripture, that "every knee should bow." If you ask a Presbyterian, he will answer with the same authority before him, that kneeling at the sacrament is an act of idolatry.

Put then a *Bible alone* into the hands of the illiterate, and leave them to their own judgement, without Liturgy or other assistance, and determine what articles of faith they shall adopt. If a Churchman withholds the *Liturgy*, when he gives a Bible to the poor, because the *Bible alone* contains all things which are necessary for salvation, he cannot consistently interfere with his *own* instruction: for if the *Liturgy* is not wanted to explain the Bible, it would be the height of presumption for a *Churchman* to suppose, that the instruction of an *individual* could be wanted. Nor would men in this case give the *Bible alone*: they would accompany it at least with a *verbal* explanation. And can any sober-minded Churchman really believe, that by putting the Bible, under the circumstances above described, into the hands of the illiterate, they will secure them from

the seductions of *false interpretation*, and the consequent defection from the *established church*? I know indeed that a very respectable writer, whose sentiments on this subject are on many accounts important, expresses himself as follows: "I should, "as a member of the church, be very sorry to think, "that the devout study of the Scriptures could lead "to the disregard of our Liturgy; on the contrary "I should hope, that it would produce a more general acknowledgement of its excellence, as it "originally at the period of the Reformation led, "through the blessing of divine Providence, to its "establishment. The Bible, says Chillingworth, "and the *Bible only*, is the religion of the Protestant; it is the sole basis of the Church of England, and the only one, on which you, I am sure, "would wish to place it."<sup>6</sup>

Undoubtedly the Bible is the *sole basis* of the Church of England; and this respectable writer does me justice in believing, that it is the *sole basis*

---

<sup>6</sup> This is part of a Letter, which was originally a private communication to me from the Right Hon. N. Vansittart, containing remarks on my Address to the Senate, but was published by the Author, at the desire of our Chancellor, who is Patron of the Auxiliary Society in Cambridge. This Letter derives additional importance from the author's being a Vice President of the Society, and from the general circulation which the friends of the Society gave to it in Cambridge. Though I have the misfortune to view the British and Foreign Bible Society in a different light from Mr. Vansittart, I must express my acknowledgements for the candour and liberality, which pervades the whole Letter. It is written in all the amiable spirit of a sincere and benevolent Christian. Let other advocates of this Society take a lesson from Mr. Vansittart.

for which I contend, notwithstanding some late insinuations to the contrary. Equally true is the *general* proposition, that the *Bible only* is the religion of the *Protestant*. But are all Protestants *alike* in their religion? Have we not Protestants of the Church of England, Protestants of the Church of Scotland, Protestants who hold the confession of Augsburg? Have we not both Arminian and Calvinistic Protestants? Are not the Moravians, the Methodists, the Baptists, the Quakers, and even the Jumpers, the Dunkers, and Swedenborgians all *Protestants*? Since therefore Protestantism assumes so many different forms, men speak quite *indefinitely*, if they speak of it without explaining the particular *kind*, which they mean. When I hear of a Swedish or a Danish Protestant (namely one who belongs to the church established in those countries) I know that it means a person, whose religion is the *Bible only*, but the Bible, as expounded in the *Confession of Augsburg*. When I hear of a Protestant of the Church of Holland, I know that it means a person, whose religion is the *Bible only*, but the Bible as expounded in the *Synod of Dort*. In like manner a Protestant of the Church of England, is a person whose religion is the *Bible only*, but the Bible as expounded in the *Liturgy and Articles*<sup>7</sup>.—How therefore can we know, if we give

---

<sup>7</sup> Hence it is, that by the laws of this country a Churchman never qualifies, by declaring his assent only to the *Bible*. This *general* assent is admitted only from Protestant *Dissenters*, when they apply for a Licence to preach. All, that is necessary to be ascertained in respect of *them*, is, that they are Protestants, but *not* of the Church of England. What *kind* of Protestants in

the Bible only, what *sort* of Protestantism will be deduced from it? And if we believe, that the Bible is more *correctly* expounded in *our* formulary of faith than in any other, do we act rightly, if we *withhold* that formulary, and thus expose men to the danger of coming to conclusions, which we must consistently believe to be *false*? I should be as sorry, as Mr. Vansittart, to think, that the study of the Scriptures should lead to a disregard of our Liturgy. And I should equally rejoice, if that study led *all* men to the *same* conclusions, as it led our English Reformers. But where is the use of

---

other respects they may be, the legislature does not inquire, and is therefore satisfied with the *general* declaration of their assent to the *Bible*. But when a *Churchman* qualifies, he qualifies as a Protestant of a *particular* kind. *His* test therefore is not the *Bible alone*, which is the religion of *all* Protestants. By the laws of this country the *Liturgy* is the great criterion of the *Churchman*. The Clergy are required by the Canons to subscribe to the Liturgy, and also to the Articles. But *all* Churchmen, both Clergy and Laity, appeal to the *Liturgy*, as a proof of their Churchmanship. In the two Universities, where it is *especially* necessary to provide for the support of the established religion, not only Heads of Houses and Professors, but every Fellow, whether in orders or not, is bound, by the Act of Uniformity, under no less a penalty than the voidance of his election, to declare by his subscription, that he will conform to the Liturgy of the Church of England, as now *by Law established*. For similar reasons every *Schoolmaster* is required to make the same declaration. And even they, who qualify for *civil* offices, are required, under a similar penalty, not only to attend the public service of the Church, within three months after their appointment, but to join in the most solemn of its rites, the celebration of the Lord's supper, after the manner and form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer.



rejoicing at an expectation, which we know can never be realised? If the devout study of the Bible *necessarily* led to an approbation of the Liturgy, why is it still rejected by the *Dissenters*? And how are men to know, what the excellencies of the Liturgy *are*, if the Bible *only* is put into their hands? How can they make the comparison, if they have not *both* Bible and Prayer Book? Suppose, however, it were *true*, that the study of the Bible, unaccompanied by the Liturgy, would lead all men to the same conclusions, as it led our English Reformers, there can surely be no objection to put into their hands, at the *same time* with the Bible, a Book which will lead them to those conclusions *at once*<sup>3</sup>. But since we know by experience, that the study of the Bible does *not* lead all men to the same conclusions, or there would not

---

<sup>3</sup> The "Member of the established church" already quoted in Note (3), asks indeed, whether uniformity of doctrine really *is* promoted by accompanying the Bible with the Liturgy. Perhaps not so completely as might be wished. But is this a reason for *omitting* the Liturgy, when we give a Bible? Because it fails in *some* cases to do the good intended, shall we neglect it *in all*? If even *with* the Liturgy the effect is incomplete, what must be the case *without* it?—I take the present opportunity of informing this anonymous writer, who plainly shows to what party he belongs, when he speaks of the Bishop of Lincoln *contradicting* the doctrines of the Church, that though he had full liberty to examine my Address to the Senate without putting his name, so far as relates to the *subject matter*, it is no less cowardly than ungenerous to attempt (as he has done in more than one passage) to traduce the *character of the author*. Such conduct does no honour either to himself or to the Society, which he defends. When the *argumentum ad contumeliam* is wanted, one may always suspect a deficiency of the *argumentum ad judicium*.



be so many Protestants, who *differ* from the established church, may it not be said without reproach, that *Churchmen* should not content themselves with the distribution of the *Bible alone*?

### III.

But says Dr. Clarke in language, applauded by the assembly, and repeated with approbation by the distinguished advocate of this Society, "Have we forgot that we are *Protestants*? What would Latimer, and Ridley, and Chillingworth have thought or said, had they lived unto this day to bear testimony to such a declaration?" What *Chillingworth* would have said shall be examined hereafter. But it requires *no* examination to discover, what Latimer and Ridley, what Cranmer and Hooper, what our great REFORMERS would have said, could they have foreseen, that a Professor of Divinity in an English University would be publicly censured by *Churchmen and Clergymen*, within the precincts of that University, for urging the distribution of a Book, which *they* composed, and which contains the doctrines for which *they* died? It is not the distribution of the *Bible* to the poor and illiterate, (the only objects of *gratuitous* distribution) which exposes men to the danger of being seduced from the established faith, and is consequently injurious to the welfare of the Church. The danger arises from the *neglect* to give them also the *Liturgy*. And it is a gross perversion of my meaning, to ascribe to the *presence of the former*, what I ascribe only to the *absence of the*

*latter*?. But the objection would be less popular, if they *directly* denied the utility of the Prayer Book. I can make great allowance for the effervescence produced by an ardent desire to become a *genuine Protestant*. But let not men suppose, that they become *better Protestants* by becoming *worse Churchmen*. Let them not suppose, that because the Bible contains all things which are necessary for *salvation*, they do all things which are wanted on *their* parts, if they give not the Liturgy in aid of religious *instruction*. Men, who entertain *this* notion, entertain it, not in *conformity*, as they suppose, with the conduct of our Reformers, but in direct *opposition* to their conduct.

When our Reformers contended, and *properly* cou-

» In a similar strain the anonymous writer above quoted from the Shrewsbury Chronicle exclaims, "What, the *Bible* knock down the *Church*!"—No. It is not the *Bible*, that (in the elegant language of this writer) will knock down the Church; but the Church will be *undermined* if we neglect the *Liturgy*. Without the Liturgy we *cease* to be Churchmen, and become Dissenters. We give up the very book which *makes* us Churchmen. If by the term "Church" men understand the *universal Church*, or the whole body of Christians dispersed throughout the world, it is true that *our* Liturgy is not necessary for its support. *Whatever* be the form, under which Christianity is professed, it still belongs to the *universal church*. But when we speak of a *particular church*, as the church of *England*, that particular church must have something to *distinguish* it, beside that which is common to *all churches*. That our legislators are of this opinion is evident, from Note (7.) And such was the importance attached to the Liturgy by the Long Parliament, as the criterion, and the bulwark of the church, that, when they resolved to overturn the *Latter*, they forbid the use of the *former*, even in private.

tended for the *Bible alone*, they contended in opposition to those *other* sources of authority, which were recognised by the Church of Rome. Without denying the validity of those other sources, such as Tradition, and the decrees of Councils, they could never have secured to the Bible *such* an interpretation, as they themselves believed to be true. For this purpose it was previously necessary to divest it of the glosses, which perverted its real meaning. But did they *stop* here, and leave the Bible without *any* interpretation? No. One of the first steps, which were taken by Luther and Melancthon was to compose a *Confession of Faith*, which in their opinion was founded on a *true interpretation* of the Bible. This Confession was afterwards improved into the Confession of Augsburg, which became, and still remains, the standard of Lutheran faith. Our own Reformers acted in the same manner. Though they asserted, that the Bible alone contained all things, which were necessary to salvation, they did not leave the *interpretation* of it to mere chance. From a knowledge of *former* perversions, they justly apprehended perversions of it in *future*. Nor was it possible, without devising some means of security, to prevent a relapse into those very errors, which they sacrificed their lives to remove. They deemed it necessary, therefore, to employ that knowledge of the Scriptures, which they so eminently possessed, in composing a system of doctrines, which are really founded on the Bible when *rightly understood*.

But says the Dean of Carlisle (after properly observing, that "our Liturgy itself owes its establishment to the free use of the Bible among the people")

“ I greatly mistake, if among the numerous errors of the Church of Rome there exists a more dangerous tenet, than, that the Holy Scriptures themselves must be tried at the bar of the traditions of fallible men.” Now with great deference to the Dean of Carlisle, I would humbly ask him, whether we try the Scriptures by our Liturgy and Articles, or the Liturgy and Articles by the Scriptures. As far as my reading extends, I know of no Protestant, from the Reformers themselves to the Divines of the present age, who have had recourse to the *former* kind of trial. At least I can answer for myself, that I have always made the *Scriptures* the test, by which I have tried the Liturgy and Articles: and the more frequently I have tried them by that test, the more firmly I have been persuaded, that the doctrines contained in them are *warranted* by Scripture. It is on this ground, and on this ground *only*, that I recommend their distribution in *company* with the Bible, not as a “ *corrective*” as Dr. Milner calls it, but as a *safeguard* against the *false interpretations*, to which men are now exposed on every side. Our Reformers themselves acted on the *same principle*. They did not withhold the Bible from general use, and say, “ Here are the doctrines which are *decreed by the Church*.” They laid it open to all men, to compare it with the doctrines, which they deduced ; and they claimed the assent of the public to their *interpretation* of the Bible, on the ground of its *conformity* with the original. On the ground of this *conformity* our Liturgy and Articles were afterwards sanctioned by the authority of Parliament, and were incorporated in the law of the land. No doubt our



Reformers were *fallible*, like other men. But the question is not, whether they were *fallible*, but whether they *failed*; not whether they *could not err*, but whether they *did* err. And I am sure the Dean of Carlisle will not assert that they *did* err, or he would not by his subscription, agreeably to the Act of Uniformity, have declared his “unfeigned assent and consent to *all and every thing* contained and prescribed in and by the Book intitled the Book of Common Prayer.” However desirous Dr. Milner may have been, to vindicate the distribution of the Bible *alone* by the Society, of which he is so zealous an advocate, however desirous therefore he might have been to hold out to public indignation a Professor, who contends for the distribution of the Liturgy, in *company* with the Bible, it was surely incautious in a Dean and a Master of a College, to deliver before a numerous body of young men, of whom the greater part were designed for holy orders, such sentiments, as could not fail to diminish, in their estimation, the value of a book, to which they will shortly subscribe, and which is really the bulwark of the established church. It is true, that Dr. Milner had previously declared, that no man could entertain a more exalted idea of our Liturgy than himself; nor do I question the sincerity of his assertion. But when he afterwards declared, that he “would not represent the distribution of the *Bible alone*, as a thing that cannot be done with safety, unless accompanied with the *Corrective* of a Prayer Book of the Church of England;” when mentioning the Liturgy again by name, he represented it as “*a dangerous tenet*” that the Scriptures should



be tried by "*the traditions of fallible men*," his hearers could not fail to apply this last expression to the Liturgy itself; they could not fail therefore to conclude, that the Liturgy was not so necessary for a *true Protestant*, as the Margaret Professor would make them believe. Nor was this the *only* unfavourable impression, which must have been made on their minds. The very name of *tradition*, when applied by a Protestant to the Church of Rome, is a term of *reproach*. And is it wise in a dignitary of the Church to apply a term of reproach to the *Liturgy*? Let any man read the whole passage in connexion, and see, whether the expression "*traditions of fallible men*" can be construed of any thing else<sup>10</sup>. Dr. Milner first denies my position, that it was *necessary* to accompany the Bible with the Liturgy; he continues the subject of the Bible and the Liturgy, by saying (and very rightly) that the latter owes its establishment to the use of the former; and *immediately* concludes with the remark on the Bible compared with the "*traditions of fallible men*." I should be very sorry to do injustice to the Dean of Carlisle by torturing his words into a meaning,

---

<sup>10</sup> The paragraph to which I allude, in Dr. Milner's speech, is the following, as printed in the Cambridge Chronicle. "My Lord, our Liturgy itself owes its establishment to the free use of the Bible among the people; and I greatly mistake, if, among the numerous errors of the Church of Rome, there exists a more dangerous tenet, than that the Holy Scriptures themselves must be tried at the bar of the traditions of fallible men." This sentence was delivered by Dr. Milner *immediately* after his censure of my position, that the Liturgy should be distributed in company with the Bible.

which they do not really convey : but I believe, that men in general will understand them, as I understand them myself. For, when a parallel is drawn between two books *by name* ; when that parallel is *repeated*, and *also by name* ; and a third time, immediately following the second, the parallel goes on with *one* of those books again by name, but with a *circumlocution* for the other subject of comparison, it is impossible, that the circumlocution should apply to any other book, than that, which had been *already mentioned*. No allusion even had been made to any *other* book. When we consider therefore, that this speech has, with the approbation of the author, been printed in a public paper, and disseminated, not within its *usual* limits, but throughout the whole kingdom, what a notion will men form of the University of Cambridge, when they read, that the Master of a College, whose name stands deservedly so high as that of Dr. Milner, not only reprimands a Professor of Divinity, as being unnecessarily anxious for the distribution of the Liturgy, but compares that Liturgy with *Popish tradition*. Language like this, though it may well justify the distribution of the Bible *alone*, is better calculated to serve the cause of the Dissenters, than the cause of the Church.

The same effect must be produced, when, to justify the distribution of the Bible *alone*, it is asked by Dr. Clarke, whether the light of revelation “shall be conveyed through the public portals of the *temple*, or by the gate belonging only to the *priests*.” If our Reformers were now alive, those *priests* who composed the Liturgy and Articles, they would tell him

that their office was only *ministerial*; that the knowledge of the book of life was not derived from them and them *alone*; that they desired not to stop the pilgrim at the *threshold* of the temple; that they were ready to admit him to its *innermost recesses*; but, since between the portal and the altar were dark and intricate passages, where many a pilgrim had lost his way, they requested only permission to present him with a *clue*, which would lead him in safety. If the Liturgy is not wanted, why do Churchmen now object to the religious instruction of Mr. Lancaster? *Mr. Lancaster* adopts the *Bible*, and the *Bible alone*. He disdains, with our present advocates, "the gate belonging only to the priests," and approaches at once to "the portals of the temple." But having ventured without a clue to explore the innermost recesses, he was bewildered in his way, till at length he wandered to the devious passage, where Christianity itself becomes lost from the view.

#### IV.

But let us descend from allegory, and draw a parallel in common language between the religious instruction afforded by Mr. Lancaster, and the religious instruction afforded by the modern Bible Society. The former confines religious instruction to the *children* of the poor, the latter extends it to *adults*, who are frequently in equal want of it. Both agree in providing a *Bible*; both agree in leaving that Bible unaccompanied with the *Liturgy*. But

the omission of the Liturgy, in the instruction of *children*, with the consequent want of provision for their going to church, and their being educated as *churchmen*, is at present very generally admitted by the friends of the establishment, to be dangerous to the welfare of church and state.

Now the fundamental principle, which pervades the *whole* of my Sermon at St. Paul's, is the necessity, on the part of Churchmen, of associating the *Liturgy with the Bible*. In the five first sections, that principle was applied to the instruction of *children*; in the sixth to the instruction of *adults*: and if the principle is *generally* true, it must no less apply to the latter, than to the former. That my sentiments on this subject may be fully understood, I will transcribe that passage in the sixth section, which relates to the importance, of adding the Liturgy in the distribution of the Bible. "Where the Church  
 " of England is established, it is not Christianity  
 " under *any* form, which it is *our* duty to promote.  
 " *Our* exertions (though without the smallest re-  
 " straint on the zeal of other parties) must be *espe-*  
 " *cially* directed to the furtherance of that system,  
 " which we are *especially* pledged to support. The  
 " Society therefore for promoting Christian Know-  
 " ledge does not confine itself, where the Church of  
 " England is established, to the distribution of the  
 " *Bible alone*". It adds, the *Liturgy*, in which

---

" This is the expression, which has been so ingeniously tortured, though I have had the precaution, both here and elsewhere, to explain the meaning of it, by saying that the *Liturgy* should



“ those doctrines are *derived* from the Bible, which  
 “ we believe to be *correctly* derived from it. For,

be added, as being the book in which the doctrines of the Bible were *correctly* derived from it. If my objection, therefore, had been *fairly* stated at the Town Hall, it would have been simply this; that I objected (namely on the part of Churchmen) to the distribution of the Bible alone, or *without the Liturgy*. But *this* statement would not have produced the effect intended. The comparison would then have been between Churchmen and Dissenters; and as the Liturgy is the book, which makes the distinction between them, the Dissenters themselves might at least have *thought*, that the Margaret Professor was not very unwise in *contending* for the Liturgy. But by stopping short at the words BIBLE ALONE, Dr. Clarke was enabled to give a new turn to the expression, and to convert the *real* parallel between Churchmen and Dissenters into a *fictitious* parallel between Protestants and Papists. “ Have we forgot that we are *Englishmen*? Have we forgot that we are *Protestants*? ”—No. But you forget, that you are *Churchmen*.

After all, I am unable to discover where the *Popery* lies in recommending the distribution of the Liturgy with the Bible, Catholics give no *Bible at all*; whereas I contend for the *Bible* as much as any man, though I object to our losing sight of the *Liturgy*. Why, says Dr. Milner, of all the errors of Popery, there is none more *dangerous*, than that of trying the Holy Scriptures at the bar of the traditions of fallible men. But the trial, which I have uniformly made, is the trial of the Liturgy by the Bible, not the Bible by the Liturgy. But, as I was accused in my absence, and under circumstances, which would have prevented my being heard, had I been present, the whole assembly was impressed with the notion, that the Margaret Professor had so far departed from the principles of a Protestant, as to maintain that the *Bible alone* containeth not all things, which are necessary for *salvation*. It is true, that no one ventured to say so in *positive terms*, especially as I had declared in that very Address, which Dr. Milner then held in his hands, that the Bible was the “ *only fountain of religious truth*.” But men scruple not to *insinuate* what they dare not *assert*.



“ though, without the Bible, the Liturgy has no sup-  
 “ port, yet without the Liturgy men are left in *doubt*,  
 “ whether the principles of *our* faith should be em-  
 “ braced by them, or not. Without the Liturgy, they  
 “ want a *guide*, to lead them to the Established Church.  
 “ Without the Liturgy, the Bible may be *misapplied*  
 “ to doctrine and discipline most discordant with our  
 “ own. Where the Church of England therefore is  
 “ established, the Bible and the Liturgy should be  
 “ united. For *every* Christian party either finds, or  
 “ *supposes* that it finds its peculiar tenets in the Bible.  
 “ And hence the Act of Uniformity expressly en-  
 “ joins, that no Sermon shall be preached or Lec-  
 “ ture given, except in the University Churches,  
 “ till after the *Liturgy* has been publicly read.”

It is worthy of remark, that though the Sermon,  
 from which this extract was taken, passed through so  
 many editions, and was generally read, I never  
 heard of any objection, that was made to it by the  
*friends of the establishment*<sup>12</sup>. The National Society  
 was avowedly founded on the *fundamental principle*

---

<sup>12</sup> Indeed an honour was conferred on this Sermon, which I be-  
 lieve was without precedent: for at the first public Meeting at  
 Bartlett's Buildings after the Sermon was preached, it was re-  
 solved (the Archbishop of Canterbury himself being in the Chair)  
 that the publication of it should not be deferred, as usual, till  
 the time of circulating the Society's packet, but that it should be  
 printed *immediately* on account of its great importance. This re-  
 solution gave rise to the five octavo editions of it, which preceded  
 the Society's edition, consisting of five thousand copies. But how  
 greatly soever it may be approved by the *friends of the establish-  
 ment*, I must of course, and indeed for this very reason, expect  
 that it will be assailed by those, who are unwilling, that the Na-  
 tional Religion should be made the foundation of National Edu-  
 cation.

of that Sermon; and in the Address to the public, which was printed at the head of the Resolutions, for the regulation of that Society, the *Liturgy* was mentioned by *name*, as essential in religious instruction. The principle; which, when applied to the instruction of *children*, had been illustrated in my Sermon by the system of Dr. Bell, was illustrated in the same Sermon, when applied to *adults*, by the practice of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. Between the system of Dr. Bell, and the practice of this Society, which is a Society for *Bibles and Prayer Books*, there is the same analogy, as between the system of Mr. Lancaster and the other Society, which is a Society for *Bibles alone*. The application of the principle to this other Society was *implied* however in the Sermon, and not formally *expressed*. But when the Address to the Senate, which contains precisely the *same sentiments* as the sixth section of the Sermon, and several sentences even in the *same words*, exhibited an application of the principle to this Society *by name*, it was *then* discovered, that the general principle, for which I had contended, was equally directed to the Lancasterian System and the Bible Society. It was *then* discovered, that sentiments which were *approved* when supposed only applicable to the former, were matter for reproach when it was found that they applied to the *latter*. And the fundamental principle of the whole Sermon appeared in a *new light*, as soon as the *extent* of it was distinctly perceived. The very men, therefore, who had supported me in its application to the religious instruction of Mr. Lancaster, (among whom I may reckon Dr. Milner him-

self<sup>13</sup>,) were suddenly converted into zealous *opponents*. Even friendship was sacrificed, and it was determined, that the Author of the Address should be crushed. The result is known; the Speeches made on the occasion are before the public; and I have now presented my defence.

But the analogy of this Society to the Lancasterian System, extends only to its operations *at home*, or where the *Church of England* is established. Its operations *abroad* are not only unobjectionable, but *highly laudable*: and, though I think they have been greatly exaggerated, though I think they have been described in terms, which violate both truth and candour<sup>14</sup>, they are certainly productive of great and unmixed good. The Liturgy of *our Church* has no concern with the distribution of Bibles, where Christianity is professed under a *different form*. Neither duty nor interest require us, in this case to do more than distribute the *Bible*. For *this purpose* I would gladly offer the right hand of fellowship, not only to *Protestants* of every description, but to the members of *all other churches*, dispersed throughout the world. For *this purpose*, we should *all*, as Christians, engage on *equal terms*. Being concerned *alike* with the distribution of the *Scriptures*, being alike desirous of promoting the *general cause* of christianity, we should act on a principle, which *was common to all*. The welfare of the *universal Church* would

---

<sup>13</sup> I draw this inference from Dr. Milner's readiness, when I waited on him, to subscribe to the National Society.

<sup>14</sup> See the Appendix.

be promoted, and the welfare of the *Church of England* would be unimpaired. But, when Protestant Churchmen and Protestant Dissenters combine for the distribution of Bibles *at home*, and a Society thus composed *omits the Liturgy*, because the Dissenters could not otherwise partake of it, *such* a Society is formed on terms of inequality, and the *sacrifice* is made on the part of the *church*.

## V.

That its dangers will increase in proportion as the Liturgy is disregarded, is not the surmise of a gloomy imagination, but a *fact*, recorded in the annals of our country. The history of religion in the reign of Charles the First will especially supply us with matter for serious reflexion. Some time before the Liturgy was *formally abolished*, we may discover in the writings of the English Divines, not only of the puritanical, but even of the royal party, such traces of indifference in this respect, as will assist us in explaining the subsequent events. The very writer, who is quoted by Mr. Vansittart, though a godson of Archbishop Laud, and a declared enemy of the puritans, had a notion of *generalised* Protestantism, which perfectly accords with the notion at present entertained by the advocates of the modern Bible Society. In a passage immediately preceding the sentence, which Mr. Vansittart has quoted from the works of Chillingworth<sup>15</sup>, this celebrated writer

---

<sup>15</sup> Mr. Vansittart has not mentioned in *what part* of his works the sentence is contained, but it may be seen on turning to page 290 of the folio edition of 1704.



explains himself in the following words. "By the  
 " *Religion of Protestants* I do not understand the  
 " doctrine of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon,  
 " nor the Confession of Augusta, or Geneva, nor  
 " the Catechism of Heidelberg, *nor the Articles of*  
 " *the Church of England*, nor the Harmony of Pro-  
 " testant Confessions." Then comes the sentence,  
 that "the Bible only is the Religion of Protest-  
 " ants." The Protestantism therefore of Chilling-  
 worth, was not the Protestantism expressed in our  
 Liturgy and Articles, but Protestantism *in the ab-*  
*stract*, that is, abstracted from all *particular* Con-  
 fessions of Faith, and among the rest, as he ex-  
 pressly declares, from that, which is adopted by *the*  
*Church of England*. Indeed it is well known that  
 Chillingworth had *objections* to our Liturgy and  
 Articles<sup>16</sup>, though he was introduced, in two of the  
 late speeches, as a *companion* for Latimer and Rid-  
 ley, who were Cranmer's chief assistants in *compos-*  
*ing* the Liturgy and Articles<sup>17</sup>. But though Chil-  
 lingworth, as appears from the preceding extract,  
 rejected from his general notion of Protestantism  
 the *particular* Creeds which he mentions by name,  
 he could not refuse to admit, that *some* Conse-

<sup>16</sup> See the article Chillingworth in the Biographia Britannica.  
 Note (K).

<sup>17</sup> Nor is this the *only* difference between them. Latimer and  
 Ridley, who were born more than an hundred years before Chil-  
 lingworth, were educated in the Church of Rome, and became  
 Protestants. Chillingworth was educated in the Church of Eng-  
 land, and went over to the Church of Rome. And though he  
 became a *Protestant* again, he became, as we see, a *generalised*  
 Protestant.

quences must be deduced from the Bible as Articles of Faith. For he adds, a few lines afterwards, that Protestants receive nothing as matter of faith and religion, "besides *It* (namely the Bible) and the plain *irrefragable and indubitable* Consequences of it." But Protestants of *every* description, however various and even *opposite* in their opinions, claim severally for themselves the honour of deducing from the Bible "irrefragable and indubitable consequences." The doctrine of conditional salvation is an "indubitable consequence" to the Arminian; the doctrine of absolute decrees an "indubitable consequence" to the Calvinist. The doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, and the Sacraments, which the Church of England considers as "indubitable consequences" of the Bible, would *not* be so, if the Unitarians and the Quakers were right in the consequences which *they* deduce from the Bible. But the consequences, which *they* deduce appear "indubitable" to *them*: and since they appear as well as ourselves to the *Bible alone*, we cannot according to Chillingworth's own definition, refuse them the title of *Protestants*. Now the notion of *generalised* Protestantism, which admits of no reference to any *particular* Creed, was well adapted to prepare the minds of men in the reign of Charles the First, for the subsequent abolition of the English Liturgy<sup>18</sup>. And if this system of generalised Pro-

---

<sup>18</sup> The celebrated work of Chillingworth, entitled, "The religion of Protestants a safe way to Salvation," which he wrote after his return from Popery, was first published in 1637. It was highly esteemed, as a controversial work *against the Catho-*

testantism, which is likewise maintained by Mr. Lancaster, continues to be maintained in the practice of the modern Bible Society, and in the vindications of its advocates, we may apprehend the same effect from the operation of the same cause. Men become so enamoured of the Protestant in the *abstract*, that they abstract themselves from the Protestantism *by law established*.

If we proceed in our inquiries, and examine the several steps, which intervened between the introduction of this notion of generalised Protestantism, and the abolition of the Liturgy altogether, we shall find additional matter for serious reflexion at the present period. The party comprehended under the name of Puritans, which was daily increasing in numbers and power, were secretly attached, as well to the *discipline*, as to the *doctrine* of Calvin, though they continued to affect a regard for the Liturgy, till their plans were ripe for execution. But, as soon as Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Wentworth, Earl of Strafford, were committed to the Tower, the Long Parliament began to concert measures for its total abolition. The first step was taken by the upper House in March 1640-1, when a *Committee for religion* was appointed, consisting of *ten* spiritual, but of *twenty* temporal Lords, with power to call to their assistance such Divines as they approved. Hav-

---

*lics*, and was universally read as soon as published. But it served the cause of the Puritans as much as the cause of the Church; inasmuch as the Protestantism, which it defends, is *generalised* Protestantism, according to the system of Mr. Lancaster, and the modern Bible Society.

ing debated on the subject of the *five Points*, and condemned the *Arminian* exposition, the Committee proceeded to a reformation of the *Liturgy* : but after various debates, which continued nearly two months, the Committee broke up without coming to a decision<sup>19</sup>. A measure, adopted about the same time by the House of Commons, was more effectual, because it went on so broad a basis, that the object in contemplation was not immediately perceived. The puritanical party in that House, under the pretence of removing the anxiety of the episcopal party, who saw dangers to the church arising from every quarter, proposed the following oath, which was called the Protestation. “ I, A. B. do  
 “ in the presence of Almighty God, promise, vow,  
 “ and protest, to maintain and defend, as far as law-  
 “ fully I may, with my life, power, and estate, the  
 “ true reformed Protestant religion, expressed in the  
 “ doctrine of the Church of England, against all Po-  
 “ pery, and Popish innovation within this realm,  
 “ contrary to the said doctrine ; and according to  
 “ the duty of mine allegiance, I will maintain, and  
 “ defend his Majesty’s royal person, honour, and  
 “ estate <sup>20</sup>.” The episcopal party, not aware of the *generalising* system of the Puritans, and supposing that the words “ Protestant Religion expressed in  
 “ *the doctrine of the Church of England*,” meant the Protestant Religion expressed in the *Liturgy*, that

---

<sup>19</sup> Collier’s Ecclesiastical History, Vol. II. p. 799.

<sup>20</sup> The whole of the *Protestation*, which contains also other matter, may be seen in Rushworth’s Historical Collections, P. III. p. 241. It was proposed and taken on May 3, 1641.



is, according to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, *as by law established*, very readily concurred in this oath of Protestation. But they soon discovered, that the *secret* object of the Protestation, was to *abolish*, instead of *supporting* the Liturgy, which the Puritans now called the Service Book. For on the 13th day of the same month, when petitions were presented to the House of Commons by the two Universities in favour of the Church Establishment, and the episcopal party appealed to the late Protestation in support of those petitions, the majority of the House, which consisted of Puritans, came immediately to the resolution, that the words in question, “are not to be extended to the maintaining of *any form of worship*, discipline, or government, nor of rites and ceremonies <sup>21</sup>.”

Within a few months after this resolution a bill passed both Houses to exclude Bishops from a seat in Parliament <sup>22</sup>: and the King was at length compelled to give his assent. The Liturgy, having fallen into *discredit*, began now to be laid aside, though the use of it was continued by the Episcopalians as the only means of prolonging the existence of the still established church. Nor were the Puritans themselves less aware of its importance. They determined therefore to take the earliest opportunity of preventing the use of it altogether. When the civil war had broken out, and the power of the Convoca-

<sup>21</sup> The whole Resolution is given in Rushworth's Historical Collections, Part III. p. 273.

<sup>22</sup> This Bill is given at length in Scobell's Collection of Acts, p. 21.

tion was at an end, the Parliament resolved to appoint in its stead an *Assembly of Divines* composed of members better suited to its purpose<sup>23</sup>. This new Assembly of *Divines* was not composed entirely of *spiritual* persons, for some of the most zealous members, both of the upper and of the lower house, are placed at the head of the list ; and scattered among the names of its inferior members are those of three Prelates, the Primate of Ireland, with the Bishops of Exeter and Bristol. The Assembly soon adopted a set of Resolutions (presented to parliament in the form of a Petition) of which the eighth was, that “ *the whole body and practice of Popery*, may be “totally abolished<sup>24</sup>.” Now by the expression “body and practice of Popery,” they could only mean the doctrine and discipline of the *Church of England*, which was still established by law, and was alone therefore “the body and practice” which could be *abolished*. Indeed the terms *Liturgy* and *Popery* were among the Puritans *synonymous* : and at the very time they were destroying the Church of *England*, they invariably pretended, that their measures were directed against the church of *Rome*.

At length on the 26th of August, 1645, the Lords and Commons assembled in parliament, repealed, at the suggestion of this Assembly, the Acts which had been passed in the reigns of Edward and Elizabeth, in *support* of the Liturgy, and enacted, that it be no

---

<sup>23</sup> The ordinance for this Assembly is given in Scobel's Collection, p. 42-44. It is dated 12 June, 1643. The names of the persons appointed are all enumerated in this ordinance.

<sup>24</sup> Rushworth's Collection, Part III. Vol. II. p. 345.

longer used in any place of public worship<sup>25</sup>. The reasons alleged by the Assembly of Divines, are given in the Preface to the Directory, which they substituted for the book of Common Prayer<sup>26</sup>. They allege that “the Liturgy used in the Church of England, notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the compilers of it, hath proved “an offence not only to many of *the Godly at home,* “*but also to the reformed churches abroad :—that “the Prelates and their faction* have laboured to “raise the estimation of it to such a height, &c.— “that the *Papists* made their advantage this way, “boasted that the Common Prayer came up to a “compliance with a great part of their service, &c.” Thereupon they declare that they have agreed to set aside the Common Prayer, “not from any love to “novelty, or intention to disparage our *first Re-* “*formers,*—but that we may in some measure answer the gracious providence of God, which at “this time calleth upon us for *further Reformation.*” But the Liturgy, though the use of it was prohibited in public, continued to be used in private houses by the friends of the established church, whose numbers were still considerable<sup>27</sup>. The Puritans therefore,

---

<sup>25</sup> See Scobel's Collection, p. 75-76.

<sup>26</sup> The Directory, so called from its containing *directions* in regard to the forms of public worship, is printed in Scobel's Collection, p. 77-92.

<sup>27</sup> Before the Liturgy was abolished, petitions had been presented to Parliament from various counties in favour of the established church: and though the means of procuring signatures to petitions at *that* time are not to be compared with the present means of procuring them, the petitions in favour of the established

who now governed in Parliament, well knowing that the use of the Liturgy, even *in private*, would keep alive that regard for the Church, which they wished to extirpate, obtained an Ordinance in the following month of August, by which the use of the Liturgy was prohibited "*in any private place or family*," under the penalty of five pounds for the first offence, ten for the second, and a year's imprisonment for the third<sup>28</sup>.

No sooner was the Liturgy thus finally abolished, than a dispute arose between the Presbyterians and the Independents, the latter of whom *dissented* from the *newly established* church, and were called therefore, in their controversies with the former, the Dissenting Brethren<sup>29</sup>. The *Liturgy*, which is a system both of doctrine and discipline, having been exchanged for the *Directory*, which relates more to the latter, the Independents, who would suffer no controul, either in the one, or in the other, applied the same terms to the Directory, which the Presbyterians had applied to the Liturgy. The *new churchmen* in vain attempted to resist the *new dissenters*, by refusing that toleration, which men of every religion may justly claim. "Beware, lest out of cowardice ye *tolerate* what God would *not* have tolerated," said one of their preachers in his Sermon be-

church were signed by nearly *fifty thousand*. See Collier's Ecclesiastical History, Vol. II. p. 822.

<sup>28</sup> See Seobel's Collection, p. 97.

<sup>29</sup> In 1648, a book was published in London called, "Papers and Answers of the Dissenting Brethren and the Committee of the Assembly of Divines."



fore the Commons. "Take heed of *Toleration*," said another in his Sermon before the Lords, "For God's sake, my Lords, let us not leave a *Reformation*, which may need a *Toleration*<sup>30</sup>." But the *intolerance* of the Presbyterians found a counterpoise in the *power of the army*, which was thrown into the scale of the Independents. In this manner was *discipline* set afloat, as doctrine had been before : and public worship in the churches of this kingdom was regulated by the discretion or caprice of the officiating minister. Hence the number of religious sects, which arose about that period, exceeded all that are recorded in the catalogues of Irenæus, Epiphanius, and Augustine. One of the celebrated preachers of *that time*, said in a Sermon before the Parliament, "There is such a numerous increase of *errors and heresies*, that I blush to repeat what some have affirmed, namely, that there are no less than *an hundred and fourscore* several heresies, propagated and spread in the neighbouring city, and many of such a nature, that I may truly say in Calvin's language, the errors and innovations, under which they groaned of *late years*, were but tolerable trifles, children's play, compared with these damnable doctrines of devils". Bishop Beveridge in his

---

<sup>30</sup> These Sermons were preached, the one on March 25th, the other on April 29, 1646. More extracts of the same kind may be seen in Ch. V. of the work called, "A Century of Presbyterian Preachers."

<sup>31</sup> See Mr. Case's Thanksgiving Sermon for the taking of Chester.—Also in the year 1646, (which was several years after the Liturgy began to be neglected, and one year after the *total*

Sermon on the Excellency and usefulness of the Common Prayer, (a Sermon which should be read by every member of the Bible Society) says likewise in reference to that age, and to the abolition of the Liturgy, "People being deprived of that, whereby they "should have been edified, were immediately tossed "to and fro with every wind of doctrine, until at "length many of them fell into the most pernicious "and damnable heresies, that were ever heard of in "the Church. *Yea together with the Liturgy* they "laid aside all distinction between sacred and common things, by which means the whole nation "was in danger of being overspread with profaneness and irreligion<sup>32</sup>."—Yet the very men, who are described in these extracts, had the Bible in *constant use*: the sectaries of that age were ready with a

---

abolition of it) Mr. Edwards, a Calvinistic Clergyman, published a book containing many curious facts, under the title of "Gangræna, or a catalogue and discovery of many of the errors, "heresies, blasphemies, and pernicious practices of the Sectaries "of this time, vented and acted in England these four last years." I would particularly recommend a perusal of this book to those gentlemen who now contend for the distribution of the *Bible alone*. Even the *Imprimatur* of this Book is a curious document; it runs thus, "Reader, that thou mayest discern the mischief of "Ecclesiastical Anarchy, the monstrousness of the much affected "Toleration, and be warned to be wise to sobriety, and fear and "suspect the pretended *New Lights*, I approve that this Treatise "discovering the Gangrene of so *many strange Opinions*, should "be imprinted."

<sup>32</sup> I take this opportunity of reminding the advocates of the Bible Society, that by their *own* acknowledgement, the Bible is capable of perversion, or they would not be perpetually boasting, that they give it without note or comment.

text of scripture for *every occurrence*, whether trivial or important. With the Bible in their mouths, they overturned both the altar and the throne. But they had the *Bible alone*, or unaccompanied with the *Liturgy*: they *expounded*, every man from his own *caprice*: and the sectaries became as *numerous*, as the interpretations of the Bible were *various*.

The tender page with horny fists was gall'd,  
 And he was *gifted* most, that loudest bawl'd.  
 The *Spirit* gave the doctoral degree,  
 And every member of a company  
 Was of his *Trade* and of his *Bible* free. }  
*Plain* truths enough for *needful* use they found,  
 But men would still be itching to *expound*.  
 Each was ambitious of the obscurest place,  
 No measure ta'en from *knowledge*, all from *grace*.  
 Study and pains were now no more their care,  
*Texts* were explained by *fasting* and by *prayer*.  
 This was the fruit the *private* spirit brought,  
 Occasioned by *great zeal*, and *little thought*.  
 While crowds *unlearned*, with rude devotion warm,  
 About the sacred viands buz and swarm.  
 The *fly-blown text* creates a crawling brood,  
 And turns to maggots what was meant for food.  
 A thousand daily *sects* rise up and die,  
 A thousand more the perished race supply.  
 So all the use we make of Heaven's discover'd will,  
 Is not to have it, or to use it ill <sup>33</sup>.

---

<sup>33</sup> Dryden's *Religio Laici*. Ver. 405-424.—By way of contrast, not only with Bishop Beveridge, but even with the Calvinistic Divines above quoted, I will add a passage from Dr. Milner's Speech, which he introduced almost immediately after his censure of my position, that the Liturgy should accompany the Bible. "It is my firm belief, that, if Dissenters of all denomi-

## VI.

I HAVE thus shewn, as well from history as from argument, that the Liturgy is essential to the welfare of the established church; and that in proportion, as the former is disregarded, in the same proportion the latter must be endangered. I have been the more diffuse on this subject, because among all the writers, who have engaged in the controversy about the modern Bible Society, I do not perceive that any one, except myself, has pointed out the danger arising to the established church, from the practice of neglecting to give the *Prayer Book* with the Bible<sup>34</sup>. I have read again what was written

---

“ nations, by no means excluding Roman Catholics, or the members of our own communion, did but read and study their Bibles more constantly, and with more devout care and application, and with more of a direct view to improve the heart and correct the practice, *Christians of every denomination, without exception*, would approach much nearer to one another than they now do, *would actually coincide, or nearly so, in most essentials, &c.*” Surely, Dr. Milner, with his knowledge of ecclesiastical history, a knowledge, which he himself proclaimed in his own speech, could not be ignorant, that even in the *essentials* of Christianity, very *different* conclusions have been drawn from the Bible, and by men, of whom it would be very unjust to say, that they had not studied it *devoutly*. There is, however, *one* method of producing *uniformity* of sentiment among those, to whom Bibles are distributed, even if they receive not the Prayer Book, and that is, by the addition of *Tracts*. If for instance, they who withhold the Liturgy, accompany the Bible with Calvinistic Tracts, the Bible in *such* company, will be *uniform* in the production of Calvinism.

<sup>34</sup> The passage in my Sermon at St. Paul's, relative to this subject, has been already quoted in the fourth section of this



by the two principal combatants, Dr. Wordsworth and Mr. Dealtry, and I do not find any *allusion* to

---

pamphlet, and the Address to the Senate contains precisely the same sentiments. Having stated the time of foundation and other circumstances relative as well to the *ancient* as to the *modern* Bible Society, I proceeded as follows :

“ The two Societies *agree* in the very laudable object of distributing Bibles both at home and abroad, though the number of Bibles distributed by the latter, especially abroad, greatly exceeds the number distributed by the former. For not only are the funds of the latter much superior to those of the former, but those funds are employed in the distribution of Bibles *only*, whereas the funds of the former are employed partly on Bibles, partly on Prayer-Books, and partly on Religious Tracts, which are in unison with the doctrine and discipline of the Established Church.

“ From this short statement it appears, that the former, or the *ancient* Society, is not only a *Bible Society*, but likewise (what the other is *not*) a *Church-of-England Society*. With the former it is an invariable rule, in promoting Christian Knowledge, to keep in view the Doctrines, which the members of the Society believe and maintain. Especially where the Church of England is established, they consider it as *their* duty to promote Christianity, not under *any* form, but under that particular form, which, above every other, they are *pledged* to support, which alone is the *tenure* of ecclesiastical and even of civil preferment. In conformity with that rule, the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge (the *ancient* Bible Society) distributes, in its home circulation, as well the *Liturgy* as the *Bible*: for though in the spirit of true Protestantism it acknowledges the Bible as the only *fountain* of religious truth, yet it knows, from the experience of all ages, that the waters of that fountain will be clear or turbid, according to the channel into which they are drawn. And as the members of the Society *believe* (though without reproach to those whose belief is different) that the doctrines of the Liturgy are *correctly* derived from the Bible, they consider it as their indispensable duty, to

this danger, though the more I consider it, the more I am convinced of its magnitude. It is true, that the question was agitated whether *religious tracts* should accompany the Bible. But *this* is a question, of very inferior moment to the question, whether the

---

“ unite the one with the other. Indeed uniformity of doctrine  
 “ can never be produced without an adherence to this rule: for  
 “ every Christian party either finds, or *supposes* that it finds, its  
 “ peculiar doctrines in the Bible. But this salutary rule, so ne-  
 “ cessary to promote uniformity, so desirable therefore by every  
 “ true Churchman, *cannot* be observed by the *modern* Bible  
 “ Society: for such a rule would not only be contrary to its  
 “ present avowed object, but absolutely inadmissible from the  
 “ very *Constitution* of the Society.”

I am aware indeed, that the Christian Observer (under the head of Religious Intelligence for December 1811) has informed his readers that a Noble Earl, to whom I sent the Address, has confuted it in the following single sentence. “ After all you  
 “ have said, I am wholly unable to see, how the most extensive  
 “ circulation of the Bible, can possibly injure the Church of  
 “ England.” I admit, that the Noble Earl did write to me a Letter containing this sentence. But it *cannot* be a *confutation* of my Address, for this plain reason, that it is no *contradiction* of it. The very Address, of which it is here called a confutation, *recommends* the circulation of the Bible: for it describes that circulation as a “ very *laudable* object.” The very Address, therefore, which is thus represented by the Christian Observer, and indeed by other advocates of the modern Society, as *inimical* to the circulation of the Scriptures, is itself a proof of its being *friendly* to that circulation. I am equally with the Noble Earl, and the whole army of my opponents, who are accustomed to say the very same thing, unable to comprehend how “ the most ex-  
 “ *tensive* circulation of the Bible can possibly injure the Church  
 “ of England.” The point, on which I am at *issue* with them is, whether the Church of England may not possibly be injured by an EXTENSIVE OMISSION OF THE LITURGY.

*Liturgy* shall accompany the Bible. The *Liturgy* is the *Criterion* of the Churchman. The *Liturgy*, by the law of the land, is the *Test* by which Churchmanship is tried. Whoever rejects the *Liturgy*, ceases to be a *Churchman*. But in respect to *Tracts*, every man may exercise his own judgement, not only in respect to the *choice* of them, but in respect to the question, whether he shall omit them altogether. The *primary* duty of a Churchman is to provide the poor with *Bibles and Prayer Books*: the providing them with *Tracts* is only a secondary consideration. No harm can be done by giving the *Prayer Book* with the Bible: *much* harm may be done by giving *Tracts* with the Bible. On the other hand, *much good* may be done by the addition of *Tracts*, if they are *properly* chosen: and I believe there is no collection of *Tracts*, which upon the whole is more entitled to the approbation of the true Churchman, than the twelve volumes published by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge<sup>35</sup>.

---

<sup>35</sup> This Collection is arranged under the following heads; Tracts on the Holy Scriptures, on public and private Devotion, on the Catechism, on Confirmation, on Baptism, on the Holy Communion, on Christian doctrine and practice, on particular duties, against common vices, on the education and instruction of children and families, against Popery, against Enthusiasm.—Tracts against *Enthusiasm* are particularly useful in the present age, whatever opinion may be formed of this, or that particular Tract. By Enthusiasm is not meant a well-tempered religious zeal, without which no Clergyman can be extensively useful. In religion we should have *zeal*, and also *moderation*: we must only endeavour (said Sir Richard Steele) to keep fire out of the one and frost out of the other. The advocates of the Bible Society,

But let us return to the Liturgy, and take a review of the several very interesting facts recorded in the preceding section, which deserve the more attention, as they have a striking similarity to the events *now* passing before us. We have seen, that in the first place was introduced a system of *generalised* Protestantism, of Protestantism *in the ab-*

---

who certainly avoid the extreme of *frost*, prefer the Tracts against Popery, which are very excellent, and very useful, though not the *only* Tracts, of which we stand in need. But there is a *peculiar advantage* in quoting the Tracts against Popery, an advantage indeed of a *two-fold* nature. For since the Church of Rome admits Tradition to be *one* source of authority, and the Bible *another* source, every true Protestant, when arguing with a *Catholic*, must contend for the *Bible alone*. And as the very *nature* of the controversy between Catholics and Protestants excludes all consideration of the *Liturgy*, the Tracts against Popery by our most distinguished Divines, will supply passages in abundance, where mention is made of the *Bible alone*, and *no* mention is made of the *Liturgy*. Hence the practice of the modern Bible Society is *apparently* justified by such distinguished names as Tillotson, and Secker. But would Tillotson and Secker in a controversy with *Dissenters*, have approved the *distribution* of the Bible alone. Would *they*, would especially the latter, who wrote Lectures on the *Church Catechism*, have justified the neglect of giving the Prayer Book with the Bible? We have already seen what Bishop Beveridge, who was a *contemporary* of Tillotson, thought on this subject. And Tillotson himself, though bred among the Puritans, must from his *own* knowledge of the mischiefs which arose from the neglect of the *Liturgy*, have been induced to abstain from *recommending* that neglect. He well knew, that the grand distinction between Protestant *Churchmen* and Protestant *Dissenters* lies in the adoption or rejection of the *Liturgy*. He knew also, that the overthrow of the Church, of which he was a witness, proceeded not from Popish, but *Protestant Dissenters*.



*stract*, or of Protestantism *abstracted* from all peculiar creeds. This soon became the favourite system of the Independents. And we know, that it is a favourite system with the present advocates of the Bible Society; for they soar into the regions of high Protestantism, till *the Church of England* entirely disappears. Of the generalizing system we have seen another instance in the famous *Protestation*, which the Puritans proposed to the Episcopalians: for while the latter *supposed*, that the members of the House of Commons were protesting in *favour* of the Liturgy, the former, though using the *same words*, were protesting *against* it. An error, which bears some resemblance to it, is very prevalent in the modern Society, where we find protestations so very comprehensive, as *not* to comprehend the Liturgy. When the *Assembly of Divines* was instituted for the express purpose of advancing the cause of religion, it was honoured with the names of *three Bishops*, and two *Heads of Houses* in Cambridge<sup>36</sup>. These things are worthy of notice, because it has been said, that the modern Society can never be injurious to the Church, because several Bishops and Heads of Houses have joined it. Further, the *Assembly of Divines*, when they had formed the re-

---

<sup>36</sup> I must not, however, neglect to mention, that the *Margaret Professor* was a member of this Assembly.—The names of the members are all given in the Ordinance for its appointment, printed in Scobel's Collection, p. 42. It is remarkable, that no Heads of Houses, and no Professors at *Oxford*, were enrolled in this *Assembly of Divines*.

solution of abolishing the *Liturgy*, presented a petition to Parliament, to abolish "the body and practice of *Popery*." At present also a Professor of Divinity is accused of *Popery*, because he pleads for the *Liturgy*. The *Assembly of Divines*, even when they *set aside* the *Liturgy*, declared they had no intention to *disparage our first Reformers*, of whom they speak in terms of the greatest respect. In like manner, the advocates of the *modern Society* profess *enthusiastic* regard for our Reformers, though they think it unnecessary to distribute the work, which those Reformers *composed*. The *Assembly of Divines* declared, that "the providence of God called on them for *further Reformation*." Whether the *modern Society* will lead to *further Reformation*, is now the subject of inquiry. But there was another feature in the *Assembly of Divines*, which we may distinctly perceive in the *modern Society*. It consisted chiefly of Calvinists: and the Calvinistic Clergy of the Church of England are generally members of the *modern Society*. Now a man, who adopts the doctrines of Calvin, cannot be *zealously* attached to our English *Liturgy*. A Calvinist may in *many respects* have a great regard for it: but he cannot have *much pain* in parting with it, as it abounds with passages so decisive of *conditional* salvation, that no ingenuity can torture them into the language of *absolute* decrees<sup>37</sup>. Indeed we know that the English Li-

---

<sup>37</sup> When our *Liturgy* teaches us to pray, that the rest of our life may be pure and holy so that we may come to eternal joy;—that the ministers of Christ may so prepare the way, that we may

turgy was so offensive to the Calvinists of Scotland, that the very attempt to introduce it in that country produced an insurrection, which ended with the solemn League and Covenant, to which the English Calvinists acceded. And this very *Assembly of Divines* declared in the Preface to the Directory, that “ the Liturgy used in the Church of England, notwithstanding all the pains and religious intentions of the compilers of it, hath proved *an offence*, not only to many of the *Godly* at home, but also to the *reformed churches abroad*.” Now the foreign churches, which go by the name of “ *reformed churches*,” are *Calvinistic*, the others being called *Lutheran*: and the persons, to whom the term “ *Godly*” is applied, whether in ancient or in modern times, are easily understood.

Lastly, let us remember, that the language holden by the Calvinists in the reign of Charles the First exactly corresponds with the language *now* holden by many of the advocates of the modern Society. For a more intolerant and more persecuting spirit was never witnessed, than is frequently displayed in their writings and speeches, as sufficiently appears from the examples only, which are quoted in this Inquiry. The only difference is in favour of the *ancient* orators, who had the candour to declare their meaning,

be found *acceptable* in his sight ;—that we may *so* pass through things temporal as *finally to lose not* the things eternal ;—that we may *so* faithfully serve him in this life, that we *fail not finally* to attain his heavenly promises ; such and similar expressions it is *impossible* to reconcile with *Calvin's* doctrine of salvation, which *entirely excludes* conditionality.

and to exclaim without reserve, "*Take heed of Toleration.*"

Should it here be asked, whether arguing from analogy, and the experience of past ages, I am apprehensive, that the *same* measure which was finally adopted by the Assembly of Divines, will be adopted in the present age, and that a *direct* attempt will be made to abolish the Liturgy by a formal appeal to the Legislature, I would answer, that I do *not* suspect it. But I am not without apprehensions, that something *similar* will be attempted. We know, that the *Liturgy*, by the laws of this country, is the *Test* of the Churchman; and, that a repeal of the *Test Act* is a thing, which has been already attempted, and is certainly not abandoned: Since therefore the *indirect* mode is the most practicable, we have the most reason to apprehend it. And here let me ask every cool and impartial observer, whether any thing can be better calculated to prepare the way for a repeal of the Test Act, than the rapid progress of the modern Bible Society. In proportion as the Liturgy is disregarded, in the same proportion must the *Test*, which in other words is the *Liturgy itself*, appear unimportant. Indeed, if the Liturgy is of so little consequence, as is now represented, the *Church Establishment* cannot be worth retaining, for it is the *Liturgy*, with its rubrics, which *constitutes* the service of the Church. That the *Dissenters* should unite under the banners of this modern Society is not a matter of surprise. And, if they unite under its banners for the very *purpose* of obtaining a repeal of the Test Act, no one has a right to blame them. It is their *interest*



to do so, and, if Churchmen *encourage* them, the Dissenters themselves are free from reproach. But beside the Dissenters, it is well known, that a considerable body of *Churchmen* are friends to a repeal of the Test Act. And, if they consider the progress of this Bible Society, as affording the means of *obtaining* their favourite object, they have a two-fold advantage in view, one of which is the removal of a restriction, which they consider (whether truly or not) as impolitic and unjust.

That there are Churchmen and Statesmen, who are not only desirous that the Test Act should be repealed, but consider the present progress of the British and Foreign Bible Society, as the most *effectual means* of obtaining that repeal, can hardly admit a doubt. The speech of Mr. Whitbread, at the late meeting at Bedford for the formation of an Auxiliary Society, is so decisive on this subject, that further evidence is superfluous. After dwelling with pleasure on the advantages of having the *Bible alone*, he said, “ he firmly hoped and believed, that in a  
 “ *time much shorter than could have been antici-*  
 “ *pated*, Christians will maintain their christian cha-  
 “ racter and profession, without regarding the *points*  
 “ *of difference* which subsisted among them. The  
 “ barrier *from this time* might be considered as  
 “ *broken down*; and it should be his endeavour, to  
 “ demolish and prevent the *vestige* of it from being  
 “ left<sup>38</sup>.” Now the barrier between Churchmen and

---

<sup>38</sup> I have copied this passage from Mr. Whitbread's Speech, as printed in the Cambridge Chronicle of December 27, 1811; and,

Dissenters, the barrier interposed by the *law of the land*, is the Test Act. What therefore can we conclude, when it is said, that not a *vestige of this barrier* shall remain, than, that a repeal of the Test Act is in contemplation? And the progress *already* made toward the effecting of this purpose, by the rapid advance of the Bible Society (to which we have had nothing similar, since Peter the Hermit went preaching the Crusade) was viewed, in such a light, that this barrier *even then* was represented as "*broken down.*" And, if it was broken down by the Auxiliary Society at *Bedford*, what *further* havoc must have been made on this barrier by the Auxiliary Societies, now established at Colchester, at Ipswich, at Huntingdon, and in *the University of Cambridge!*

I know indeed, that there are *other* Statesmen not inferior in talent to Mr. Whitbread, who espouse this Society with equal zeal; and yet, when the repeal of the Test Act is proposed (as Mr. Whitbread intimates, and which the Dissenters are really *encouraged* to attempt) will think it their duty to *oppose* that repeal. And, as no man would *designedly* encourage what must tend to *facilitate* a measure, which he *disapproves*, we must conclude, that every Statesman, who is desirous of *retaining* the Test Act, and yet promotes the progress of this Society, promotes it without apprehending the injurious effects, to which, if the arguments already used, have any

---

as it was inserted by order of the Bedford Committee, the Speech so printed may be considered as an official document.

validity, it must ultimately lead. I sincerely lament, that I have the misfortune to differ upon this subject with men of such distinguished abilities, and such acknowledged integrity, that this difference alone is sufficient to excite a distrust of my own opinion. But I have considered the subject in all its bearings, and perhaps with more attention, than can possibly be bestowed on it by men in high situations. It is of all subjects, on which I ever undertook to write, the most intricate and perplexed. And, though at various times I have instituted inquiries, which demanded close reasoning and profound thought, I never entered on a subject, which required *so much* penetration, as the present. It is a subject of so extraordinary a nature, that, while orators, whose wisdom never goes beyond the surface, feel competent to decide, there are points in it, which may elude the discernment of the most sagacious and profound. Nor is it difficult to assign the reason.

There is nothing, which so prevents men from seeing the *danger* of an object, as, when in the *pursuit* of that object, they are animated by *religious zeal*. With the prospect of extending the *universal* church, men find it difficult to contract their views within the limits of a *single* church. With the prospect of promulgating the gospel to *distant regions*, where its light had never shone, they view, through a glass inverted, the danger *at home*. And to the danger, thus diminished, they are ready to close their eyes, if the *removal* of that danger obscures the glory of the prospect.—But if I have succeeded in presenting that danger in its *true light*, and its *natural magnitude*, we have then sufficient guaran

tee, that it will be averted as zealously, as it has been inadvertently promoted.

If I have *succeeded* in presenting that danger in its true light and its natural magnitude, we may *then* also be assured, that every *other* Churchman, who is swayed by *religious* motives, will be ready to *apply* the remedy, which shall appear most conducive to its removal. Their regard for the *general* good will outweigh the private feelings, which accompany the acknowledgement of a mistake. They will recollect that the wisest and best of men are liable to error; that they are *especially* liable in the great and important concerns of religion; and that there is *no* subject, in which, from its extreme intricacy, men are *so* liable to error, as in the present. We have further assurance in the repeated declarations of distinguished Churchmen, who have often declared, that they never would encourage the Society, if they perceived any danger, and who are pledged therefore to seek a remedy, when they *do* perceive it. And those respectable Bishops, who have honoured the Society with their patronage and support, to whom no man of common sense would ascribe dishonourable motives, since the higher our rank the more deeply are we involved in considerations as well of interest, as of duty, those respectable Bishops, who as constituted guardians of the church, are more than *other* men responsible for every act, which may *endanger* it, will, I am confident, examine with care and impartiality, the arguments which are used in this Inquiry, and, if finally they are of opinion, that danger *exists*, will suffer neither time to be lost, nor labour to be spared, in the application of a remedy. Nor is the



responsibility *much* less in those, who preside in the two Universities : for if the Society is attended with *evil*, it receives a ten-fold augmentation, by being fixed in a seat of education. If an evil is great when only *local*, what must it be, when established in a place, where the youth of this kingdom will be *taught to embrace it*, and to *disseminate* that evil throughout the British dominions ?

## VII.

HAVING explained what I apprehend to be the *chief danger* of the modern Bible Society, I ought not to close the Inquiry, without considering what *remedies* may be applied. But before we consider what *may* be applied, let us consider what may *not* be applied, because the question will be thus reduced to a narrower compass, and more easily brought to a point.

If the Church is in danger from this Society, the most effectual remedy, in the opinion of its *advocates*, is that Churchmen in general should become members of it, and thus obtain a preponderance over the Dissenting Interest. On this account Mr. Vansittart, in his Letter above quoted hopes that the time is not far distant, when the Society will be patronised by the whole episcopal bench. "This (says Mr. Vansittart) "would appear to me the "most effectual remedy for any supposed danger "from the *dissenting influence* in the Bible Society ?" —But is it not owing to the *dissenting influence*,

that, when the Society distributes Bibles *at home*, those Bibles are not accompanied with *Prayer Books*? Are not Prayer Books *omitted* for this very reason, that it is a *joint concern* between Churchmen and Dissenters? A religious Society, consisting of *Churchmen*, has nothing to prevent it from distributing both Bibles and Prayer Books. But as soon as the *dissenting influence* is mixed with the *Church influence*, the distribution of the Prayer Book by a Society so composed is at once *prevented*. Even therefore, if all the Bishops and all the Clergy in England and Wales became members of the Society, it would still remain a Society for *Bibles alone*. No preponderance whatever, on the part of the Church, could alter the *constitution* of the Society. The evil consequences therefore of neglecting to give the Prayer Book with the Bible, instead of being *diminished* by an accession of Churchmen, are really *increased* by it. For every addition of Churchmen is an addition of *contributors* to the evil.

If it be said, that Churchmen, who become members of this Society, are not restricted in their *individual capacity* to the distribution of the *Bible alone*, I answer, that the very circumstance of their joining this Society, though it does not actually *prevent* their procuring Prayer Books elsewhere, has a *natural and necessary tendency*, to diminish in the opinion of Churchmen themselves, both the *importance* of the Liturgy, and the consequent frequency of its *distribution*. As this *tendency* of the Society is very important in its effects, and yet in general is not perceived, it will be worth our while to analyse, and

examine it in its several relations. I would not insist on the *additional difficulty*, to which men are exposed, when the Bibles and Prayer Books, which they distribute to the poor, must be sought in *two* Repositories instead of *one*, because this additional difficulty *might* be overcome by a proportional increase of zeal for the Book of Common Prayer. But the misfortune is, that as the difficulty *increases*, the inclination to remove it *diminishes*. When men are accustomed to procure Bibles from a Society, which furnishes at the same time the Prayer Book, they acquire the *habit* of associating the one with the other. But a habit of a contrary description is acquired by belonging to a Society, which furnishes the *Bible alone*. This habit occasions a *forgetfulness* of the Liturgy, with a consequent *indifference* to it. And this indifference is increased by a co-operation with those, who not only *omit* the Liturgy, but *reject it altogether*. Nor is mere *indifference* to the Liturgy the sole effect of this Society. Men are always inclined to *justify* the conduct of the Society, of which they are members; for in so doing they justify *themselves*. Hence it is, that the *fundamental law* of this Society, the distributing the *Bible alone*, becomes even among *Churchmen*, in the first place a matter of *excuse*, and gradually a matter of *approbation*, till at length the apology must be made by those, who *contend* for its union with the Liturgy. Such is the consequence of this boasted union between Churchmen and Dissenters. When men of *different* religious principles are accustomed to act in *concert*, and to act on the principle of *one* party, that principle not only becomes the leading principle of the

*whole body*, but gradually *approves* itself to the whole body. When Churchmen, who *have* a Liturgy, and Dissenters who have *none*, agree in forming a Society, which by its constitution *excludes* the distribution of the Liturgy, the *whole* Society conforms to the principle of the Dissenters. For, though there is a principle, which is common to them all as *Christians*, namely the distribution of the *Bible*, yet the principle, which is peculiar to the *Churchman*, is wholly *disregarded*. Hence arises that notion of *generalised* Protestantism, which has been lately the theme of admiration: and because the *Bible only* is the religion of the *Protestant*, they disregard all *distinctions*, which separate *one* class of Protestants from *another*. In this manner do Churchmen become advocates of a principle, which, *if they had ever belonged to this Bible Society*, they would probably have *condemned*.

In the preceding paragraph I have estimated the *tendency* of this Bible Society to produce an indifference to the *Liturgy*, among Churchmen in *general*: and I have shewn, that the bare *connexion* with it is sufficient to produce the effect, even when unassisted by the operation of *other* causes. I have taken nothing for granted, in respect to any *peculiar* doctrines, which those Churchmen may espouse, who are the most zealous *advocates* of this Society. The arguments, which I have here used, have derived no part of their energy, from the consideration of that bias, which the principles of *Calvinism* may give to those Churchmen, who are members of the Society. I have not argued from the practice (whether real or imaginary) of Churchmen supplying the



place of the Liturgy with Calvinistic Tracts ; though, if it be *true*, that, such Tracts (or even *verbal* Expositions) are communicated with the Bible, the omission of the Liturgy may be more easily explained. I have left *this* consideration to those, whose connexions may afford them the means of more accurate information. I have here appealed to *no fact whatever* ; I have deduced an inference by the sole aid of *abstract reasoning*.

But facts *may* be produced, and facts incontrovertible, which put the *truth* of the inference beyond a doubt. The speeches and writings, which have been lately given to the public, contain decisive evidence on this subject : and I sincerely rejoice, that my Address to the Senate has been the means of bringing the Advocates of the Society to a full *explanation* on this subject. The tendency of their Society is now *apparent*. And the means of averting the *danger* of it will be the more readily applied, in proportion as that danger is more distinctly perceived. It would be a waste of time to quote every sentence, in which my objection to the *distribution of the Bible alone or without the Liturgy* has been publicly censured. Quotations have been already given from the Letter of Mr. Vansittart, and the speeches at Cambridge : and after *such* authority, we need not appeal to other Letters, or other Speeches. It is sufficient to say, that my objection to the omission of the Liturgy *has* been condemned by the advocates of the Society ; that they have *generally* condemned it, wherever the Address has been noticed ; and that the most distinguished of these advocates have been the most *strenuous* in

their reproof. The FACT therefore, that the practice of neglecting to give the Prayer Book with the Bible, is now *justified*, and justified by *Churchmen themselves*, is established beyond contradiction.

Shall we recommend it therefore to Churchmen to become members of a Society, which not only has a *tendency* to bring the Liturgy into neglect, but which already as we know by experience *produces* that effect. If Churchmen by becoming members of it, learn to *justify* the omission of the Liturgy, it cannot be supposed that they will *correct* that omission by supplying *individually* what the Society in its corporate capacity *withholds*. If they learn to *censure* the position, that Churchmen should not content themselves with giving the *Bible alone*, it would be very extraordinary if they afterwards *conformed* to that position. And, since the vindication of the neglect in question, is sanctioned by the authority, not merely of *minor* orators, and *minor* letter-writers (whose number indeed is now considerable) but of distinguished and exalted characters, whose opinions must influence the *public*, it would be a poor consolation to produce examples of churchmen, who, though members of this Society, are sensible of its defects, and endeavour to supply them by their *individual* exertions. For such examples would not only be exceptions to the *general rule*, but exceptions to the *vindication* of that rule. We must argue, not from *single* instances, but from the *general* character of the Society, and its *general effects*.

And what *are* those general effects, but to bring into neglect the *bulwark of the established church*? When Churchmen and Dissenters unite in a Society

for the distribution of the *Bible alone*, even where the Church of *England* is established, and Churchmen conform to this regulation, because the Dissenters could not otherwise join with them, they sacrifice their *own* principles to those of the *Dissenters*<sup>39</sup>.—If the operations of the Society were confined to *foreign* countries, the objection, which is founded on the omission of the Liturgy, would at once be removed. The Liturgy of a *particular* church has no concern with the distribution of Bibles, where that church is *not established*. But where it *is* established, we must either preserve the *criterion and test* of that establishment, or abandon the establishment *altogether*. When Churchmen and Dissenters therefore agree to act on a principle, which *excludes* that criterion and test, and excludes it where the Church of *England* is established, an union of *such* parties on *such* a principle, must ultimately lead to

---

<sup>39</sup> As far as I can judge, the very reason which is assigned for *not* giving the Prayer Book with the Bible, is a reason why Churchmen should be careful to *abstain* from that neglect. The more desirous the Dissenters may be, that the Prayer Book should be *omitted*, the more desirous should Churchmen be to *distribute* it. But if I understand Dr. Milner rightly, he considers the objection of the Dissenters to the Liturgy, as a reason not only why Churchmen may *omit* the Liturgy, when they give the Bible, but why they may omit it *with safety*. For he says, as the adoption of the Liturgy “is not to be expected while Dissenters of  
“several denominations adhere to their present system of ceremonies and church government, I would not represent the distribution of the *Bible alone*, as a thing that cannot be done *with safety*, unless accompanied with the *Corrective* of a Prayer  
“Book of the Church of England.”

## THE RUIN OF THAT PARTY, WHICH MAKES THE SACRIFICE.

When Dissenters distribute the Bible alone, they do *all* that is requisite on *their* part. They have no Liturgy to distribute; and consequently omit *nothing*, which either their duty or their interest requires. But, when Churchmen, who *have* a Liturgy, neglect to distribute it with the Bible, both duty and interest are neglected on *their* part. They neglect the distribution of the book, which *constitutes* the Churchman. They make approaches therefore to the Conventicle, while the Conventicle makes no approaches to the Church. Thus the Church is undermined, while the Conventicle remains entire.

So long therefore as the British and Foreign Bible Society retains its *present constitution*, I can discover no other remedy for the evil, which has been the subject of this Inquiry, than, that Churchmen should *withdraw* from it, and *transfer* their contributions and their influence to that true *Church of England* Society, the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge <sup>40</sup>.

---

<sup>40</sup> I will here take the opportunity, in reference to the preceding Note, of exposing one of the many misrepresentations, to which my defence of the Church has exposed me on every side. One of the Orators at Huntingdon, whose speech is recorded in the Cambridge Chronicle of January 10, 1812, took the liberty of informing his hearers, that there was an unnatural son of the Church, who did more than intimate "that the circulation of the pure Word of God without note or comment endangered her, and that those Scriptures stood in need of a CORRECTIVE." Of the misrepresentation in the first part of this sentence enough



## VIII.

I know, indeed, that Mr. Vansittart has prepared against this proposal so redoubtable a dilemma, that the advocates of the modern Society regard it as *impregnable*. If Churchmen withdraw themselves from the British and Foreign Bible Society, one of two consequences, says Mr. Vansittart, will inevitably follow. The Society will either cease to exist; or, it will be conducted in future by Dissenters alone. Now I readily admit, that from those premises, one of these two consequences *must* follow, and therefore that no exception can be taken to the *dilemma itself*. Let us next attend to the *application* of it, and begin of course with the *first* part of the alternative.

“In the first case (says Mr. Vansittart) you would  
 “have crushed an establishment, which has done  
 “more for the diffusion of *Christianity*, than has

---

has been said already. But as the Orator has here ascribed to me a term, which I have *never used*, and I have the charity to suppose that he did it by mistake, misled perhaps by Dr. Milner's Speech, it is necessary for me to declare, not only that I never *applied* to the Liturgy the term *Corrective*, but that I have never spoken of it in such a manner, as to warrant the conclusion that I *consider* the Liturgy as a *Corrective* of the Bible. On the contrary, I represented in that very Address, which has been the subject of criticism, the Bible as *the Corrective of the Liturgy*, not the Liturgy as a *Corrective of the Bible*. See the passage quoted in Note 34, where I recommend the Liturgy on the ground that “the *doctrines of the Liturgy* are correctly derived from the Bible.”

“ been effected in the same space of time in any age  
 “ since the *Apostolic* ; which has in *seven years* been  
 “ the means of preaching the gospel in *fifty-four lan-*  
 “ *guages*. This would indeed be putting out *one of*  
 “ *the eyes of Britain.*”—Now even were it *true*,  
 that the exertions of this Society in foreign countries  
 were *entitled* to the panegyric here given them by  
 Mr. Vansittart, I should not hesitate to declare, that  
 if its operations *at home* produce the mischief,  
 which I have been endeavouring to shew, *that* mis-  
 chief will not be compensated by a translation of the  
 Bible into fifty-four, nor *ten times* fifty-four foreign  
 languages. That system of universal philanthropy,  
 whether political or religious, which carries men so  
 far in their *general* benevolence, as to find “ one of  
 the eyes of Britain” any where but in *Britain itself*,  
 must in spite of that very patriotism, which Mr.  
 Vansittart *himself* possesses, lead ultimately to the  
 destruction, both of church and of state. I know  
 indeed, that Anacharsis Cloots, one of the instru-  
 ments of the French Revolution, used to style him-  
 self the *Orator of the human race*, and to assert, that,  
 a true philosopher should *divest* himself of the pre-  
 judices contracted by the *accidents* of birth and edu-  
 cation ; that he should love all countries *alike* ; and  
 be ready therefore to sacrifice his own to the *good of*  
*mankind*. Nor is it long, since a universal philan-  
 thropist in *this* country asserted, that a father of a  
 family should love *other* families as much as *his own* ;  
 and in consequence of this *extensive* benevolence he  
 left his own family *without food or raiment*, and,  
 when conducted before a magistrate, persisted in re-  
 fusing them relief. But I am not ashamed to acknow-

ledge, that I would rather possess the *narrowness* of paternal and patriotic affection, than the boasted universality, which *extinguishes* that affection. I would not starve *my own* children to feed the children of the *stranger*, though I *give* to the stranger what I can *spare* from my own. Nor would I endanger the *Church*, to which I belong, for the sake of sending Bibles, however numerous, to *foreign* churches, though I would gladly contribute to the latter, when it can be done *with safety to the former*.

Even therefore, if the exertions of the Society in foreign countries were really as great, as they have been represented, I should still think the safety of our own Church required the *first* consideration. But since those exertions have been represented in such splendid and dazzling colours, since they have been considered as a new *propagation of the Gospel*, and since the various translations, which this Society is said to have made of the Scriptures, are regarded by its advocates as a *renewal of the Pentecost*, when the Apostles were enabled to speak to *all nations* in their several languages, I have thought it proper to inquire into the *foundation* of these pretensions, but shall reserve *that* Inquiry for an Appendix, because my arguments in the *present* Inquiry have no dependence whatever on the truth or falsehood of those pretensions, though I believe that hundreds and thousands have subscribed to the Society in *consequence* of those pretensions. Now it will appear from that Appendix, that the editions of the Scriptures, already printed or *caused* to be printed by this Society, in languages, *into which they had never been translate..*

before, so far from amounting to FIFTY-FOUR, which the *ambiguity* of Mr. Vansittart's expression, aided by the *splendour* of his description, might induce men to suppose, amount to a very few more, than a *tenth* of that number<sup>43</sup>. It will further appear, that among the translations, *now* preparing in India, there are several in languages, into which the Scriptures had been *already* translated. It will appear, that others had previously issued from the missionary press at Serampore, *independently of the aid of the Society*. It will also appear, that among the *European* languages, in which they have reprinted, or *assisted* in reprinting the Scriptures, some of them are spoken in countries, where the Bible is already so common and so cheap, that to speak of this Society as being "*the means of preaching the Gospel*" in those countries, is really to speak in terms not suited to the subject. And to speak of *Germany* as

---

<sup>43</sup> Previous to the late Meeting at Ipswich for the formation of an Auxiliary Bible Society, Mr. Clarkson informed the public through the channel of the Suffolk papers, that the Society had "*translated* the Scriptures into no less than *forty-three* different "*languages or dialects.*" See the Ipswich Journal for November 23, 1811. But when Mr. Clarkson's Letter was re-published in Cambridge, with a superscription alluding to my Address to the Senate (see Note 4) the learned *Editor* had the precaution to *amend* the text of his *Author* by inserting in a bracket [printed or] before the word "*translated.*" Now it makes a material difference whether *new translations* are made, or *old translations* reprinted; otherwise, we may say with equal justice, that the *King's Printer* is "*the means of preaching the gospel*" as often as he prints an English Bible. But if *this* is meant, men should not compare it with *the day of Pentecost*.



wanting Bibles, which the foreign Secretary himself has *hitherto* done ; of *Germany*, which had printed the Scriptures in Hebrew, in Greek, in Latin, and in German, before England had printed them even *in English* ; of *Germany*, the cradle of the Reformation, the birth-place of Luther, whose translation was partly transfused into our own ; of *Germany*, where the Canstein *Bible Institution*, established a century ago, can multiply copies by thousands and tens of thousands ; of *Germany*, where every bookseller can furnish German Bibles to any amount at a price inferior to *fourteen English pence* ; to speak of *such a* country as wanting Bibles, is more than could have been expected, even from the zeal of our present advocates <sup>42</sup>.

But since it is of no importance to the Inquiry *now* before us, whether the exertions of the Society in foreign countries are such, as have been represented or not, I shall reserve every thing, which I have to say on *that* subject, for an Appendix. At present let it be *granted*, that this Society has printed or re-printed, the Bible in fifty-four languages, let it be granted also, that these editions have been printed by the *sole* exertions of this Society, let it be

---

<sup>42</sup> I am aware, that there is *now* in the press a Speech of the foreign Secretary which I have been desired to see, and which gives a *very different* account from all that had been *said before*. But all the *other* speeches at Cambridge, which now have been printed above a month in the Cambridge Chronicle, and have remained *uncontradicted* by the authors of them, might *also* at this rate, be new-modelled in consequence of my objections to them. On this subject I shall say more in the Appendix.

granted that *none* of them would have been printed, if this Society had not existed, let it be granted even, that these fifty-four editions are in languages, in which the Scriptures *had never appeared before*, and lastly let it be granted, that the extinction of these *foreign translations* would be the extinction of "*one of the eyes of Britain*," yet, with all these concessions, it is no necessary consequence, that this eye would be extinguished, if Churchmen adopted the proposal, which was made at the end of the preceding section. For it is not proposed, that Churchmen should *cease entirely* from the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts; it was only proposed that they should *transfer* their contributions and influence. I proposed, that they should *continue* to operate, and change only the *medium* of operation.

But it will be said, that the *ancient* Bible Society has not the *activity* of the modern one. Let this be admitted. Let the inferiority of its energies be admitted in any proportion you please, yet, if those energies are exerted with *safety* to the established church, and the energies of the modern Society are *not*, we had better have security *at home*, with diminished energy *abroad*, than *diminish* our security at home, by *increasing* our energy abroad. If Churchmen, by a transfer of their contributions, should not increase the exertions of one society in the *same* proportion, as they would diminish the exertions of the other, the augmentation must at any rate be such, as to recommend itself to those, who are attached to the establishment. For a *moderate* increase in the influence of a Society, which is calculated to *support* the church, must be better than a *great* increase

in the influence of a Society, which tends to *undermine* it. Nor should we forget that there is *one* respect, in which the *ancient* Bible Society is much better calculated to promote Christianity among Heathens, than the *modern* Society. For the latter is rather a *preparatory* Society; it *prepares* the way for the exertion of missionaries, by *supplying* them with Bibles in various languages. But no missionary can be *employed* by the Society; for the sending of missionaries would be contrary to its constitution. Now the *former* Society not only *can*, but *really* does employ missionaries for the propagation of the Gospel, and would increase their numbers, with an augmentation of its funds. I know indeed, that the advocates of the modern Society think nothing more is requisite, for conversion to Christianity, than the simple operations of their own body. They think the Bible, when *once distributed*, whether among Mahometans or Hindoos, whether among Tartars or Chinese, will make its *own way*, without the aid of a missionary, to explain it, and to enforce its doctrines. But as we have the authority, not only of St. Paul, but of our Saviour himself, for believing that a *preacher* is requisite for the propagation of the Gospel, we may venture at least to doubt, whether the Bible, *unaccompanied* by a preacher, will be able, as is imagined, to extirpate, either the Koran or the Chouking, either the Vedam or the Shaster.

Let us now examine the *other* part of Mr. Vansittart's dilemma, namely, that if the British and Foreign Bible Society is continued at all, after Churchmen have withdrawn from it, the honour of

conducting it will be left entirely to the Dissenters. And here exclaims Mr. Vansittart, " Shall " it be said, that the Dissenters *alone* have carried the Word of God to *every nation under heaven?*"—Certainly not: nor does it at all follow from my proposal, which consists not in *abstaining* from action, but in action through *another medium*. Here Mr. Vansittart asks; " Can the Church of England stand so secure upon a *narrow and exclusive* policy, as by deserving the blessings, and uniting the prayers of all people, nations, and languages?" Now to speak of " all people, nations, and languages," or (in the words of the former quotation) of "*every nation under heaven,*" as conferring a blessing on the modern Society, is really to speak in terms, with which their exertions, however great, can never be commensurate. And with respect to the *narrow policy* of Churchmen and Dissenters acting in *separate* Societies for the propagation of the Gospel, I should think, that, if their *union* (how greatly soever it might raise their powers of action above the *sum* of their *separate* operations) yet contributed by its operation *at home* to endanger our own establishment, neither the wishes nor the praises of *foreign* nations would be sufficient to *avert* that danger.

But Mr. Vansittart seems to think, that the danger would be increased, if Churchmen now withdrew, and left the Society in possession of the Dissenters. This is certainly a question of great importance: for there are many Churchmen, who are aware of the dangers of this Society, and who would not have be-



come members of it when *first* established, yet are of opinion, that it is *now* the best policy to join it. Let us consider therefore with attention what Mr. Vansittart says on this subject. Speaking of the second part of the alternative he says, "The *dissenting interest* making up for these losses (namely from the secession of the Churchmen) by more extensive sacrifices, and an increase of *zeal and activity*, and availing itself of the assistance of *the foreign Societies already formed*, would carry on the Institution in nearly the same manner as before." Now in this case we should have a Society of Dissenters on the one hand, and a Society of Churchmen on the other, *both* endeavouring to propagate the Gospel, yet acting on that *exclusive policy*, on which Mr. Vansittart asks whether the Church of England can *stand so secure.*" In the first place, let us examine what accession of strength (that is of *political* strength according to the present argument) the Dissenters would derive from being left in possession of *the foreign societies already formed.* I have carefully examined the Reports of the Society, but I do not find that *any one* of their *foreign* auxiliary societies (though Mr. Dealtry also attaches the same importance to them<sup>43</sup>) have ever *contributed* to the parent Society. On the contrary, they are in the habit of *receiving* contributions: they *draw* from the parent Institution a portion of those supplies, which

---

<sup>43</sup> Alluding to the case of a separation on the part of Churchmen he says the Dissenters "would probably retain the co-operation of the continental Societies."

are afforded by the auxiliary Societies *at home*. Its power therefore, as a *political engine*, is not increased, but *diminished* by the foreign Societies. And since their attachment depends on the supplies, which they receive, they would be ready to *transfer* their allegiance to any other Society, which had equal means of supplying their demands. Nay, a *hundred* such Societies might be instantly formed, by only giving notice, that such formation would be followed by pecuniary assistance. And with respect to an "increase of zeal and activity" on the part of the Dissenters, if Churchmen seceded from the Society, there would be infinitely less to apprehend from it, than from the present union of Churchmen and Dissenters in the distribution of Bibles, without the Liturgy, *at home*. If Churchmen in general resolved to act by themselves in the distribution of *Bibles and Prayer Books*, and Dissenters formed *another* Society for the distribution of *Bibles alone*, agreeably to their respective religious opinions, the two Societies might act, without mutual bitterness, and without an *encroachment* on each other's rights. Surely harmony may be preserved, without requiring that *one* party shall sacrifice to the *other*. Nor can such a sacrifice be necessary, for the purpose of conducting their operations *abroad*. The competition which might ensue, would be a competition for good: and, as each party would retain the full possession of its *own* doctrine and discipline, there would be no drawback on either side, to interrupt the harmony of their proceedings. I agree with Mr. Vansittart (and *here* also with Dr. Milner) that the co-operation of Churchmen and Dissenters "so far as they

can *conscientiously* co-operate," is the best mode of lessening the evils of dissent. But when Churchmen and Dissenters co-operate *in the omission of the Liturgy*, which is the Bulwark of the Established Church, it is a co-operation, in which I must declare *for myself*, that as a Churchman, I cannot *conscientiously* join.

And with respect to the *danger*, for which such union is supposed a remedy, though I very clearly perceive, that a Society of Dissenters, *professedly* formed for the advancement of religion, may easily become a *political* engine, yet I cannot subscribe to the opinion of those, who think that the *dissenting interest* of the Society in question will receive the most *effectual check* from the presence and co-operation of Churchmen. The most effectual barrier against the rising power of the Dissenters would be a general union of Churchmen with *Churchmen*, all acting on a common principle, and *that principle*, the principle of the *Established Church*. But the remedy *now* applied, in the co-operation of Churchmen with *Dissenters*, though it is *considered* as effectual, is really worse than the disease. While it provides against *contingent* evil, it creates a *present one*: in the hope of preventing *political* mischief, it undermines the established *religion*; without receiving the smallest compensation, it *surrenders* the interest of the Church, by bringing Churchmen and Dissenters to act upon a common principle, which excludes what is *essential to the Church*. Thus the strength of the establishment, instead of being retained within its *own* channel, for its *own*

preservation, is not only diverted to another channel, but turns the current against *itself*.

## IX.

I: indeed the Society would consent to *change* its constitution, to become only a Society for sending Bibles *abroad*, and leave to *other* Societies, whether of Churchmen or of Dissenters, to provide the poor of *this* country, either with *Bibles and Prayer Books*, or with *Bibles alone*, according to their respective tenets, the arguments, which have been used in this Inquiry, which apply only to its *present* constitution, and its *home* department, would be obviated at once, as I have already declared, and already explained in the last paragraph of the fourth Section. If the *common principle*, on which the Society *now* acts, were so far *altered*, whether absolutely or relatively, as to render it equally *beneficial* to both parties, the equality, which is observed in the *government* of the Society, would become equally *fair* for both parties. If such an *alteration* were made in its mode of operation, as to restrict it to countries, where the pre-eminence of our *own* church, which it is necessary to preserve *at home*, had no possible concern, *such an alteration* would render the common principle of action equally beneficial to *both* parties, and remove the injurious effects, which *now* arise from placing them on the same level in respect to the *government* of the Society, while the *terms*, on which they act, are not terms of *reciprocity*. In a Society therefore



composed of Churchmen and Dissenters for the sole purpose of circulating the Scriptures in *foreign* countries, I would readily and heartily partake. I know indeed that Dr. Milner, while he held in his hand my Address to the Senate, took the liberty of declaring "The principles of the learned author, I say *again* <sup>44</sup> seem to me to have *nothing to do with Dissenters* in any concern, which is *connected with religion*." I am aware also, that he almost immediately added in commendation of *himself*, that he did not "dread the Dissenters, as if they were *infected with a CONTAGION*." I am aware also, that Mr. Dealtry has the same insinuation with Dr. Milner. For though he neither produced my Address to the Senate, nor named the Author of it, yet he so clearly *alluded* both to the one and to the other, that no one of the whole audience could be mistaken, in applying his remarks to *me*, especially, as among the persons who disapprove of the Society, I was the *only* one, who was mentioned on that day, and my Address was the subject of remark from the *very opening* of their proceedings. Now, says Mr. Dealtry, "The counsel of "those gentlemen who are hostile to the Bible Society, and who recommend us to desert it, appear "to me not a little extraordinary. They advise the "Dissenters to have their own institution upon a

---

<sup>44</sup> Dr. Milner had *previously* said, "There appears to me in "their minds, a corner, in which resides a *rooted aversion* to any "connexion in religious concerns with Christians of *any* denomination, if they dissent from the established church."

“ similar basis, but would keep *us* from the CON-  
 “ TAGION.”—Here let me appeal to the public,  
 to determine, whether the respectful manner, in  
 which I spoke of the Dissenters, as well in the Ser-  
 mon at St. Paul’s, as in the Address to the Senate,  
 whether the sentiments of religious liberty, which I  
 have proclaimed in both, ought not to have secured  
 me from a term of reproach, which though *appa-  
 rently indirect* in its application, could not *fail* to  
 be applied to me, could not fail therefore to excite  
 the indignation of every Dissenter who heard it, and  
 the indignation of every Dissenter who reads it, as  
 if I regarded their intercourse *as contagious*. I leave  
 the public to determine, whether I have deserved  
 such treatment from *Churchmen and Clergymen*, who  
 derive both their consequence and their support  
 from that very establishment, which, whether mis-  
 takenly or not, I was labouring to defend. I will  
 leave the public to judge of the *christian spirit*, which  
 animates my opponents, while they are professing a  
 regard for the propagation of the *Gospel*. But I will  
 declare for *myself*, and declare it both to Dr. Milner  
 and Mr. Dealtry, that I fear no contagion from the  
*Dissenters*. Indeed I *know* of none. There are  
 many, and *very* many among them, for whom, as  
*individuals*, I have the highest respect. I would as-  
 sociate with them even for *religious* purposes, as far  
 as my duty allowed me : and if I went *beyond* that  
 line, I am sure the Dissenters themselves would not  
*applaud* me. And were it *necessary*, I could appeal to  
 dissenting families in this town, who themselves would  
 bear witness, that, so far from dreading a *contagion*  
 from their intercourse, I freely communicate the con-

tributions which I can spare, without the smallest regard to *religious distinction*. I hope the reader will pardon this digression on a subject, which is merely personal : but as my adversaries have gone out of their way to *asperse* my character, I may take the same liberty, in order to *defend* it.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> Having once digressed, I will take the opportunity of noticing some other passages in Mr. Dealtry's Speech, which I at first intended to pass over, because his allusions to my Address had been, for the *most* part, anticipated by other Speakers and Writers. But as the very circumstance, that an argument has been used by Mr. Dealtry, is regarded by many as a presumption in its favour, and this presumption is heightened by the author's confidence in himself, and his contempt of his adversaries, I will take a cursory view of the passages relating to the present subject. Mr. Dealtry asks, "Does the dispersion of the Scriptures tend to ruin the Church?" This question has been already answered to satiety.—He observes, "We have retained every syllable of our Liturgy, our Articles and Homilies." It is true, that the Liturgy is still *retained*: but if Churchmen justify the *omission* of it when they distribute Bibles to the poor, and even censure those, who *complain* of that omission, they are certainly on the road, which *leads* to the rejection of it.—Mr. Dealtry again exclaims, "Ruin the church? Where then is the discretion of our Archbishops and Bishops, &c. &c. who have *supported* the Bible Society?" Now a man may be *discrete*, and yet *mistaken*. Even *Bishops* may sometimes err. And Mr. Dealtry, who is so anxious to be thought a genuine Protestant, must be careful not to push this argument *too far*: for whoever makes a Bishop *infallible*, adopts a tenet of *Popery*.—But he considers the distribution of the *authorised version* by this Society as an argument for the security of the Church; and asks, in the event of Churchmen withdrawing from it, "*what* security we should then have for the purity of the versions distributed throughout the United Kingdom?" Now Churchmen would have the same security, as they have *always* had, since the Legislature has *forbidden* the printing

To return however to an Association of Churchmen and Dissenters, for the purpose of distributing Bibles abroad, I *again* declare, that such an Association would be entitled to the approbation of every Churchman. On the one hand, the *general* cause of Christianity would be promoted, while, on the

---

of the *authorised version* unaccompanied with a comment, except in the two Universities, and by the King's Printer: and the Bible Society itself can obtain their copies of it from no other than these three sources. And with respect to *other* versions, it is not in the *power*, either of this or of *any* Society, to prevent their being made and distributed. But the Dissenters *in general*, if we except only the Socinians (who in spite of the Bible Society have a *new* version in extensive circulation) have no *inclination* to alter the *text* of the authorized version. Nor had they in the time of Charles the First. They are fully satisfied with *expounding* the present text: and against *false exposition* (the danger of which the Society *itself* admits by the credit which they take for giving it *without a comment*) they neglect to provide, since they *omit the Liturgy*. They neglect therefore to provide for the *real* danger. But says Mr. Dealtry, (who spake *immediately* after Dr. Milner, whose speech was a comment on my Address) "Let us never forget, that the Scriptures, *for the distribution of which we are*," *"-TH US publicly arraigned, are the Word of the Most High."* Now under the circumstances already described (and more might be added in corroboration) Mr. Dealtry himself will not pretend, that he meant not to allude to *me*. I challenge him therefore, to *produce* the passage, in which I have arraigned, either him or any one, *for the distribution of the Scriptures*. If Mr. Dealtry *examined* my Address to the Senate, before he ventured to *condemn* it, he *must have known*, that at the very *beginning* of it I represented the *distribution of the Scriptures* as a "VERY LAUDABLE OBJECT;" he *must have known*, that I objected *solely* to THE OMISSION OF THE LITURGY; he *must have known* therefore, when he declared he was arraigned *for the distribution of the Scriptures*, that what he declared was *contrary*



other hand, our *own* Church, which *no* consideration should induce us to neglect, would be left *uninjured*. Here then is the *true* line, which should guide the conduct of the Churchman. He may thus obtain the *full benefit* derived from the operations of the Society *abroad*, and obtain it *without injury at home*. Nay, this benefit would be *increased*, if the funds of the Society, were *wholly* employed in the circulation of the Scriptures in *foreign* parts.

---

*to fact.* On the one hand, if he had *not* read my Address to the Senate, he took the liberty of laying a very heavy charge to a Professor of Divinity, at a public meeting within the precincts of his own University, at a public meeting composed chiefly of *young men* of that University, of young men who attend that Professor's Lectures, and of laying this heavy charge, with the consciousness of having *no foundation* for it.—If, instead of appealing to the Address, or to the Sermon at St. Paul's, from which the sentiments in the Address were borrowed, appeal is made to a *printed paper*, which Dr. Clarke produced at the public meeting, and of which I acknowledge myself the author, (see the second line of Note 11, where I *allude* to it) that printed paper *again* contains the same sentiments, which had been advanced in the Sermon. The very first sentence is, "Whereas it has been insinuated, that they, who object to the modern Bible Society, object to the distribution of the Bible, it is necessary to reply, that their objection is NOT to the distribution of the Bible, BUT to the distribution of the Bible alone." And in order to explain what is *meant* by the objection to the distribution of the Bible alone, is added; "If to the distribution of the Bible, which the two Societies have in common, were added the distribution of the Liturgy, which distinguishes the ancient Bible Society, and distinguishes the Churchman, the chief objection to the modern Bible Society would be removed." This remark is perfectly consonant with all that has been said in the present Inquiry, and shews, that I have been always consistent in objecting NOT to the distribution of the Bible, BUT solely to the omission of the Liturgy.

If then a regard for the distribution of the Scriptures is the *sole* motive, which induces men to partake of this Society, and it is their earnest wish to pursue that object in such a manner, as to *secure the established church*, why, it may be asked, should the Society refuse to change its constitution, in such a manner, as would answer *both* of those purposes, and render unnecessary the secession above proposed? Yet I hardly expect, that this change of constitution will be made. The Society, in its *present* form, has advantages, which not every member will abandon. Though its *splendour* is derived from the operations abroad, its *influence* depends on the operations at home. It *there* provides for *temporal*, as well as *spiritual* wants. It gives *power* to the dissenter, *popularity* to the churchman, and *interest* to the politician, which is useful at *all* times, and especially at the approach of a general election.

Cambridge, 23 January, 1812.

The intended Appendix, relative to the Society's *foreign* department, will be published separately.



